DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 697 HE 002 106

AUTHOR Diekhoff, John S.; Rogers, Ida Long
TITLE A Study of Private Higher Education in Tennessee.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Council of Private Colleges, Nashville.; Tennessee Higher Education Commission, Nashville.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 83p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Enrollment, Financial Needs, *Financial Problems, Financial Support, *Higher Education, *Private Colleges, *State Aid, *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

Chapter I of this report on private higher education in Tennessee presents a brief review of the scope and variety of higher education in the state, focusing on the enrollment picture in the public and private sectors and noting that the percentage of students served by the private colleges has been declining in the last years. Chapter II discusses the special contribution of the private sector: to greater intellectual freedom, and providing a wider choice for students, close personal relationships among members of the academic community, and accessibility to higher education where public education was not available. Chapter III deals with the economic importance of the private colleges and universities in terms of enrollment, expenditures, and physical and manpower resources. Chapter IV discusses the financial future of private higher education, and concludes that it is in serious financial trouble with rising costs and declining student enrollment. Chapter V examines some of the measures taken by other states to help private institutions; and Chapter VI discusses some choices for Tennessee and suggests that the State should consider programs for the support of private higher education, while increasing support for public higher education, and that private higher education should continue to participate in the state's long-range planning task. (AF)

ED049697

A Study of Private Higher Education in Tennessee

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE002106

Tennessee Council of Private Colleges/Tennessee Higher Education Commission

1

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased for $1.00. Copies of the ***Overview***, in small quantities, may be obtained free by writing to:

TENNESSEE COUNCIL OF PRIVATE COLLEGES
1719 West End Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

ED049697

A STUDY OF
PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION IN TENNESSEE

A Joint Study Sponsored by the

Tennessee Council of Private Colleges

and the

Tennessee Higher Education Commission

by

John S. Diekhoff and Ida Long Rogers

with the assistance of Monnie S. Hatcher

Nashville, Tennessee 1970

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JOINT STUDY OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION IN TENNESSEE

Mr. John S. Bransford
4303 Harding Road
P. O. Box 50088
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. William E. Brock, Jr.
Brock Candy Company
P. O. Box 1407
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Dr. Dorothy L. Brown
3109 Centennial Boulevard
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. John M. Claunch, President
Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Parker Coddington
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Joseph J. Copeland, President
Maryville College
Maryville, Tennessee

Dr. John K. Folger, Executive Director
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
908 Andrew Jackson State Office Building
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. W. W. Grigorieff
Assistant Director of Special Programs
U. T., Oak Ridge
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

Mrs. Margaret Hyde
738 Charles Street
Memphis, Tennessee

Mr. Hugh McDade
Aluminum Company of America
Alcoa, Tennessee

Dr. Earl J. McGrath, Director
Higher Education Center
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. Felix Robb, Director
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
795 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Myron F. Wicke
Division of Higher Education
United Methodist Church
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. James S. Wilder, Jr., President
Lambuth College
Jackson, Tennessee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ADVISORY COMMITTEE—JOINT STUDY OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION IN TENNESSEE ii

FOREWORD iv

OVERVIEW vii

Chapter

1. THE SCOPE AND VARIETY OF TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION 1
2. SPECIAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR 7
3. THE ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF THE PRIVATE COLLEGES 13
4. THE FINANCIAL FUTURE OF THE PRIVATE COLLEGES 17
5. WHAT OTHER STATES ARE DOING 33
6. CHOICES FOR TENNESSEE 49

Appendices

A. PRIVATE COLLEGES OF TENNESSEE 54

B. TOTAL ENROLLMENT FIGURES 57

C. ASSETS AND PROJECTED CAPITAL OUTLAYS 59

D. INCOME BY SOURCE 61

E. STUDENT AID 63

F. NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING AID 65

G. AVERAGE COST TO STUDENT 68

H. ENROLLMENT CAPACITY 72

FOREWORD

The establishment of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission in 1967 and other recent changes in Tennessee higher education constitute clear evidence that Tennessee shares the national concern for the structure of higher education. Dr. William H. McFarland says in *State Support for Private Higher Education* published by the Southern Regional Education Board in 1969:

> The restructuring of state systems implies important issues about the future role of private colleges and universities and the extent to which state government should involve them in promoting statewide higher education goals. Should the private role continue to be more or less incidental, essentially unrelated to the public system? Or should master-planning anticipate greater involvement of private institutions in state-sponsored higher education?

The present study and studies in other states of the relationship between public and private higher education are directed toward answering these questions. This study of private higher education in Tennessee is jointly sponsored and financed by the Tennessee Council of Private Colleges and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission from private and public funds. If in the past the private role has been "more or less incidental," it is clear that in the future "master-planning" will indeed "anticipate greater involvement of private institutions in state-sponsored higher education." In *The Organization of Higher Education* published in 1964 by the Southern Regional Education Board, Allan M. Cartter, Chancellor of New York University, affirmed that from now on "states must assume responsibility for planning the future growth of higher education within the context of all existing resources of the state." The joint sponsorship of this report by the public and the private sectors sets an important precedent. It suggests that future planning for higher education in Tennessee, including the projection of new or expanded public facilities and the construction or expansion of private ones, will indeed take cognizance of the facilities, services, and potential of the private as well as the public colleges and universities and that the public and private colleges can work together on the formulation of educational plans and policies to their mutual benefit.

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission has pointed out that population growth and the anticipated increase in the percentage of youth who will seek higher education will require continuing increases

in appropriations for the public colleges and universities. If the private colleges and universities are allowed to continue their decline in the percentage of students served, or quite possibly in the absolute numbers of students served, the cost to the people of Tennessee will be greatly increased.

William J. Baumol and Peggy Heim sum it up in "Financial Prospects for Higher Education" in the AAUP Bulletin in 1968:

> The critical advantage of the dual system of control in our higher educational structure is that it has made for healthy competition, for significant diversity, for two separate sources of leadership in which each group has helped to indicate its responsibilities to the other. Thus, in the postwar period the public institutions clearly took the first step toward meeting the public educational requirements of a growing population and in this area led the way for their private counterparts. But it was the private colleges and universities which served as bastions of academic freedom in the period not so long ago when it was so seriously threatened. . . . The two types of institutions have competed in the variety of subject matter offered to students, in the quality of teaching departments, in the financing of research, and in a myriad of other ways that redounded to the benefit of higher education as a whole.

OVERVIEW

SCOPE AND VARIETY OF TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION

In Tennessee in 1968-69, 12 public colleges served more than 90,000 students and 40 private colleges and universities served more than 35,000 students. Over the years the percentage of students served by the private colleges has declined. If the contribution of the private sector relative to that of the public sector is allowed to decline, the imbalance between the two will increase, perhaps to the detriment of both, and the cost of providing facilities for public higher education will increase.

SPECIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Diversity of control in the educational institutions of Tennessee buttresses the freedom of both public and private sectors and thereby the intellectual freedom of those who teach and study in them. Different colleges have different life-styles for their students. The existence of private colleges under diverse sponsorship and with differing self-determined missions gives students a wider choice of the kind of education they want and the kind of setting in which to pursue it.

Private institutions in general are smaller than public ones and allow closer personal relationships among the members of the academic community. Their characteristic intimacy enables them to give more direct attention to all aspects of the student's growth and learning. Cognitive learning, ethical learning, and affective learning are inseparable, but the private colleges can concern themselves more directly with ethical and affective learning than can the public institutions. It is easier for them to adopt, or to devise, educational innovations for such purposes.

College attendance rises when colleges are located where people live. Clusters of private colleges have been built in the major population centers of Tennessee, but they are also scattered throughout the state. Some of them serve communities in which there are no public colleges. They provide education for about 35,000 students, half of them residents of Tennessee. Thus they relieve the state of the obligation to provide public education for these students.

ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF THE PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The state of Tennessee appropriates approximately $1,150 a year per student enrolled in its public colleges and universities. On this basis, education for the 17,500 Tennessee students enrolled in the private institutions would cost the state more than $20 million a year.

In 1968-69 the private colleges spent almost $50 million for educational and general expenses and for public service. Their total expenditures were more than $125 million. They employed more than 3,400 faculty members and hundreds of other people. They provided millions of dollars in student aid. They attracted to the state about 17,500 out-of-state students, who paid room, board, and tuition charges and contributed in other ways to the economy of the community.

The book value of the plant and equipment of the private colleges and universities is approximately $263 million. Replacement costs would be higher. New facilities to provide public education for 17,500 students would require capital outlays of not less than $50 million.

Private colleges, like public colleges, educate businessmen, physicians, dentists, nurses, lawyers, engineers, clergymen, and other professionals who practice their callings in the state. The social and economic value of their product is beyond estimation. Thus the private colleges are an asset far too valuable to be ignored in long-range planning for higher education in Tennessee.

THE FINANCIAL FUTURE OF PRIVATE COLLEGES

The private colleges and universities of Tennessee are in serious financial difficulty because the traditional sources of income—endowment, gifts and grants, and tuition—have not kept pace with increasing costs. Moreover, their enrollment is declining. Contributing greatly to the problem is the inflationary trend in the economy. Costs per student have risen faster than the economy. These colleges have, in recent years, been forced to adopt economic practices which compound the problem and raise serious doubts about their ability to maintain the quality of their educational offerings.

Increasing tuition each year is not the answer, for high cost makes it more difficult for students to attend college. Raising tuition, deferring maintenance, reducing the number of faculty, and, as a last resort, deficit financing are the techniques used by these colleges to balance their budgets.

The Biennial Report of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission predicts that the public colleges of Tennessee will need from 10 to 13 per cent more money each year during the next five years to accommodate an increasing enrollment. The appropriations for public institutions of higher education in 1969-70 were $86,602,000. The estimated minimum needed for 1974-75 is $140 million and the optimum $175 million. They will need more than that if the private colleges fail.

The Report states:

> We will probably add 36,000 students in the public institutions by 1974-75. . . . In the last three years, the number of freshmen entering the private institutions in Tennessee has declined more than 10 per cent and if tuition in the private colleges continues to rise rapidly we can expect more students to shift from private to public colleges.

If present trends continue, the public institutions will be expanding their capacity to enroll students at the same time that the private colleges have unused capacity. Tennessee's private colleges report that they can accommodate over 4,000 more students than are presently enrolled without adding to their physical plant or increasing the number of faculty. If additional faculty members were hired, the private colleges could accommodate almost 6,500 more students with their present physical plant.

It seems senseless and not in the public interest to duplicate existing educational facilities, and prudent use of the taxpayers' dollars suggests that some method be devised to moderate the enrollment trend. It also suggests that the shift in enrollment from private to public colleges, attributed to rising tuition differentials, provides Tennessee with a legitimate basis for adopting techniques which have as their goal the full utilization of the total educational resources of the state.

It can only be concluded that unless a new source of revenue is found, the contribution of the private sector to higher education in Tennessee will diminish in scope and deteriorate in quality.

WHAT OTHER STATES ARE DOING

In other states, private colleges and universities are turning to their state governments for help, and many states are providing assistance in

a number of ways. Guaranteed loans to students are generally available. Some states have scholarship or grant programs designed to encourage students to prepare for occupations which are in short supply. There are programs of aid for special population groups; for example, veterans or handicapped.

Twenty-two states have scholarship or grant programs designed to enable students to attend the colleges of their choice, public or private. The size of the grant is determined by the student's financial need and the tuition charge of the college chosen. These grants represent an indirect form of assistance to both public and private colleges.

In addition to the financial aid given to students, more direct ways of assisting private colleges are in effect or under consideration in some states. A state may make direct grants to private institutions to enable them to reduce tuition without loss of income; for example, direct appropriations may be made for operating expenses or for support of a specific educational program.

Recent legislation in New York provides for grants to eligible institutions for each person graduated. Other proposals provide for grants based on the number of resident students enrolled or the number of credit hours earned. Some states contract with colleges for specific educational programs.

There are proposals for state support of collaborative programs among groups of colleges, public and private, and for the establishment of central fact-finding and consulting services.

So far as the Joint Study Staff is able to determine, every comparable study that has been made affirms the importance of the dual system of higher education and recommends measures to strengthen and support the private sector. So does this one.

CHOICES FOR TENNESSEE

The private colleges and universities of Tennessee need financial support. Strengthening the private colleges, however, should not be done at the expense of public higher education. Public enrollment will continue to grow and costs will rise. Both the public and the private sectors must be more and more generously supported.

Long-range planning for higher education in Tennessee should take cognizance not only of the state's needs but also of all its existing educational resources, both public and private. Representatives of the public, of the state colleges and universities, and of the private colleges

and universities should take part in such planning. Therefore, the Advisory Committee and the Joint Study Staff make the following recommendations:

1. **The people of Tennessee, giving full consideration to the contributions and needs of both public and private colleges and universities, should increase their support to public higher education and, in addition, should give consideration to the early establishment of programs for the support of private higher education.**

2. **The Tennessee Higher Education Commission, in its long-range planning for higher education in Tennessee, should arrange for continuing participation of representatives of private higher education in Tennessee.** There should be continuing examination of the costs, the benefits to the state, and the consequences to both public and private colleges of various ways of supporting private colleges, leading to specific recommendations to the governor, the legislature, and the people of Tennessee for the support of private colleges.

There are many options to be considered, based on what other states are doing and on what has been proposed in Tennessee. The option to do nothing should be rejected.

1 The Scope and Variety of Tennessee Higher Education

Authors of recent studies of higher education in other states speak of the "dual system" of higher education in the United States. They contrast the "public sector" with the "private sector" and sometimes seem to imply that all public colleges are alike, that all private colleges are alike, and that they perform essentially different functions. That this is an oversimplification is nowhere better illustrated than in the state of Tennessee. In Tennessee, as in other states, one finds side by side a variety of public and private colleges.

In 1969 more than 125,000 students were enrolled in Tennessee colleges and universities—more than 90,000 in public institutions and more than 35,000 in private ones. This study is confined to private higher education in the state. Such a study should not be undertaken, however, without reference to public education. Thus this study begins with a glance at the public sector.

Among the public colleges and universities of Tennessee is a 176-year-old complex university with a 1969 enrollment (on several campuses) of more than 30,000 students, offering a wide range of undergraduate programs as well as graduate and professional programs at the highest level. Other colleges and universities range in size from about 3,500 students to more than 17,000. Programs in these institutions are somewhat less extensive but are nevertheless varied and lead to bachelor's and master's degrees in the arts and sciences and in professions such as agriculture, education, and engineering. Doctoral programs are in progress in one of them and limited doctoral programs are projected in others. The public sector also includes a group of 2-year community colleges established since 1965. In 1969 the smallest college enrolled 549 students, the largest 1,595. These colleges will grow, for criteria for establishing a community college include the expec-

tation that it will have an enrollment of at least 1,000 students within 3 to 5 years. Those in metropolitan areas are expected to be much larger in due time. Small size is not a characteristic of the public institutions.

Some of the public colleges are primarily residential institutions attracting students from all parts of the state and the nation and from foreign countries. Others exist primarily to serve students who live in their immediate area. Overall, approximately 85 per cent of the students enrolled in the public institutions are residents of Tennessee.

These public colleges and universities are the means by which the people of Tennessee, through their state government, provide opportunities for relatively low-cost education for the youth of the state. These young men and women have seized the opportunity. The total enrollment in the public colleges and universities has tripled in the decade since 1959 and now totals more than 90,000 students. The most rapid growth in the public institutions in recent years has been in graduate education and in the recently established community colleges. Graduate enrollment has doubled during the past five years and enrollment in the community colleges has grown from 400 in a single institution in 1966 to 5,622 in five colleges in 1969. Four more community colleges are being planned or are under construction. Other community colleges and technical institutes are projected. The Biennial Report of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission predicts an enrollment of from 14,000 to 15,000 in the community colleges in 1974 and an additional 4,000 to 5,000 collegiate-level students in the three technical institutes.

Through this vast and growing system of public higher education, the people of Tennessee provide, on the one hand, the highest level of graduate and professional education, and, on the other hand, low-cost terminal programs, in a variety of general and occupational areas, for students who could not otherwise attend college. Although the percentage of college-age youth who attend college in Tennessee is still below the national average, it has grown from about 33 per cent in 1960 to nearly 45 per cent in 1969. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission expects college attendance to approach 50 per cent in another 5 years. Clearly the people of Tennessee, their General Assembly, and their educational leaders recognize the need for an extensive and varied program of higher education. In establishing and shaping their public colleges, they have been committed to no single model but instead have been aware of the differing needs and interests of students, of the need for geographical distribution, and of the need of the state for a liberally educated citizenry and for people trained in a variety of skilled occupations and learned professions.

To provide this system of public higher education, it has been necessary for the state of Tennessee to multiply its appropriations for higher education almost by five during the past decade—from $17 million in 1959-60 to $87 million in 1969-70. The Higher Education Commission estimates that appropriations must almost double again by 1975, to a range of $150 million to $175 million, if the people of the state choose to provide an opportunity for all its youth who aspire to and can profit from a higher education. New sources of revenue will be necessary to meet this commitment.

The people of Tennessee also support their private colleges and universities. These colleges present, in some ways, an even greater range in size, program, institutional character, and control than do the public institutions. Vanderbilt University is a complex university of great distinction, awarding a full range of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees: A.B., M.A., M.S., M.D., and Ph.D. George Peabody College for Teachers, the other Ph.D. granting private institution, specializes in the undergraduate and graduate education of teachers and school administrators and in related disciplines. Meharry Medical College, an independent medical school, awards doctorates in medicine and provides programs in medical technology and other related health sciences. Historically, its service has been primarily to the Negro community.

Scarritt College, which awards both bachelor's and master's degrees, specializes in the education of church workers. The Southern College of Optometry awards bachelor's degrees with specializations in the biological sciences and professional degrees in optometry. Among the private colleges, 27 of them are exclusively or almost exclusively 4-year institutions awarding only the bachelor's degree, although some award first professional degrees in fields such as religious education. The Memphis Academy of Arts is a single-purpose institution offering specializations only in Fine and Applied Arts, combining "the academic tradition of higher learning" and the "artistic tradition of the atelier." Seven are junior colleges. Thirty of the private colleges enjoy church support from a variety of denominations, and some classified as "independent" profess strong Christian orientation. These colleges are a primary source of lay and professional leadership in their several denominations.

The private colleges and universities range in age from 4 to 176 years. In 1969 the smallest college enrolled 145 students, the largest 5,963. Their teaching faculties ranged in size from 11 to 1,245. They offered educational programs in the liberal arts and sciences with

the full range of "majors" or specializations characteristic of American colleges generally. In addition, they offered undergraduate or graduate professional programs in professional or otherwise vocationally oriented fields such as premedicine, predentistry, preveterinary medicine, medicine, dentistry, law, all branches of engineering, business, secretarial science, teaching at all levels and in many fields, educational administration and supervision, counseling and guidance, and music, journalism, police science, home economics, nursing, medical technology, library science, and theology.

With reference to the public sector, the Biennial Report of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission states that unless Tennessee "can provide advanced occupational, professional, and technical education to more of the youth of the state, we will not have the type of labor force in Tennessee which will be needed to accelerate our economic growth, and come closer to the national average in per capita income." Apparently the private colleges, in addition to their emphasis on undergraduate liberal education, also make a contribution to a trained labor force. Of the more than 35,000 students in private institutions, approximately 50 per cent are residents of Tennessee.

A recent study of higher education in Texas bears the title *Pluralism and Partnership: The Case for the Dual System of Higher Education.* Clearly this brief description of the public and private colleges in Tennessee indicates that the first half of the title of the Texas study is more descriptive of the American system of higher education than the second half. It is a pluralistic system, not merely dualistic, and it is a system in which both privately supported colleges and publicly supported colleges play many roles. It has been asserted that anything that can be said about American higher education is true somewhere. Certainly it is true that Tennessee's institutions of higher education are many and diverse—diverse in size, in scope, in self-determined missions, in student populations, in support, and in control. Not all of the diversity resides in the private sector, but much of it does.

It is not argued here that the quality of education in private institutions is superior to that of public institutions. Neither private nor public colleges are of uniform quality. The strength in either sector fosters strength in the other, and the pluralism—the diversity of control and purpose—is a major source of strength not only in American higher education generally but specifically in Tennessee. However, public policy in Tennessee as elsewhere has been such that the part played by private colleges in the education of American youth has been rapidly declining in relationship to the part played by public institu-

tions. For example, the number of students enrolled in private colleges of Tennessee has increased slightly between 1965 and 1969 (from approximately 34,000 students in 1965 to approximatey 35,000 in 1969), yet the percentage of students attending private colleges has steadily declined, as follows:

Year	*Per Cent in Private Colleges*
1965	35.7
1966	35.1
1967	33.8
1968	32.3
1969	28.0

The sharp drop in percentage in 1969 resulted primarily from the shift of the University of Chattanooga and Chattanooga City College from private to public control and the establishment of 2 public junior colleges. Although there was a slight overall increase in enrollment from 1968 to 1969 in the remainder of the private colleges (i.e., if the shift of 2 private institutions to public support and control is ignored), not all the colleges shared in this growth. Enrollment declined in 15 of the 43 colleges reporting in 1968 and in 20 of the 40 reporting in 1969. Twelve colleges had lower enrollments in 1969 than in 1966. Two have not reported their 1969 enrollment, and one has not reported for 1966.

The private colleges as a group project an increase in enrollments in 1970 to 35,718. They also project enrollments of 43,302 in 1975 and 48,703 in 1980. These figures actually underestimate the projections since 4 of the smaller colleges are excluded from the future figures but not from the past, because they have made no predictions for the future. If it is assumed that they would remain at their last reported size, the projections for the future would be increased by 1,415. It is hoped that the failure of these colleges to project future enrollment is not prophetic.

Except for 2 colleges that did not report 1969 enrollments and one that did not report 1966 figures, it may be assumed that reports for those years are accurate. The 1970 estimate may be close, although only 2 of 21 colleges with lower enrollments in 1969 than in 1968 predict a decline in 1970. The projections of some of the institutions for 1975 and 1980 may be educated guesses and may reflect plans for special recruiting efforts. Others may be overly optimistic. For example, the 12 institutions which reported decreases during the 1968-69 period had combined enrollments of 9,944 in 1966 and 8,988 in

1969. They anticipate 9,845 in 1970. Although 9 of these colleges had lower enrollments in 1969 than in 1968, only 2 predict decreases for 1970, and as a group they project an increase of 9.5 per cent next year. They are even more sanguine about the longer periods: they project enrollments of 12,676 in 1975 and 14,807 in 1980.

On the basis of recent trends, reservations must be made about some of these projections. During the period from 1966 through 1969, reported enrollments in all colleges in the state, public and private, grew from 106,596 to 125,775—an increase of 17.9 per cent. *Enrollment in the public sector increased by 27.9 per cent while those in the private sector increased by 0.1 per cent.* Enrollments in the 12 colleges discussed here decreased by 10.6 per cent. Yet these 12 as a group project increases of 41 per cent during the next five years and of 65.8 per cent during the next decade. In the light of the careful prediction of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission that overall enrollment growth will slow down during the next five years, it is hard to view these projections as realistic.

Although these comparisons are based on the last four years, the trend toward faster growth in the public than in the private colleges has been long established. During the decade beginning in 1959, enrollments in the public colleges of Tennessee increased by about 300 per cent. During the same period, enrollments in private colleges increased by approximately 50 per cent.

The number as well as the size of public colleges has increased during the decade. Not so in the private sector. Three private colleges were established during the decade, but one closed in 1964. A private law school was transferred to a university in another state in 1961. As indicated earlier, one of the smallest and one of the largest of the private institutions shifted to state control and sponsorship in 1969. Meanwhile, the state also established five new community colleges, authorized four more, and projected others.

Of course, it has been no part of public policy to weaken private higher education. The concern of the people of Tennessee, the members of their General Assembly, and the leaders of their public colleges has been to provide educational opportunities for the youth of the state, and the most obvious way to accomplish this objective has been through the multiplication and expansion of public colleges. For a number of reasons—not least among them the rising costs of higher education—there has been in recent years a lively interest nationwide in reexamining and restructuring state systems of higher education.

2 | Special Contributions of the Private Sector

The size, scope, and variety of both public and private colleges in Tennessee have been described briefly. It has also been affirmed that strength in either sector contributes to strength in the other. The economic contribution of the private colleges to the state will be discussed in a later section. This chapter describes some of the special qualities of the private colleges and universities and the significance of their existence. Recent reports prepared in several states do this, the Texas report with special effectiveness, but it is important enough to do again.

The President of the Southern Regional Education Board, Dr. Winfred L. Godwin, makes the first important point in his Foreword to the Board's study, *State Support for Private Higher Education:*

> The essence of higher education must always be dedication and freedom to expand knowledge. That means primarily freedom to question and to seek the truth in a manner that is sometimes discomforting to society and in a manner that historically has resulted, on occasion, in the intrusion of governmental pressures.
>
> Private institutions, by and large, are not necessarily freer than public institutions, but they frequently are, and when necessary, they can be. They represent the concept of scholarship free from government pressure, and as such they are an invaluable countervailing force in American education.
>
> Thus the value of the private sector far outweighs the portion of the higher educational load it bears.

It may be agreed that private institutions are not necessarily freer than public ones, but it may also be agreed that not infrequently distinguished private colleges and universities have been the outstanding

champions of the free marketplace of ideas. The president of one of the colleges participating in this study puts it succinctly when he says that his college is "committed to provide a climate for examination of values and for responsible dialogue on any subject regardless of restrictions that might be imposed in state education." In a period of campus unrest, when colleges and universities have become conspicuous centers of controversy and conflict, when they are hampered by adverse publicity and harassed by threats of repression, when their traditional purposes and procedures are being challenged and changed, when candidates for office have discovered how easy it is to run against disaffected youth or against college administrators, the private colleges and universities may indeed have a special contribution to make. The Texas study finds hope of this in "their independence and potentially more flexible approaches."

"Private colleges," another Tennessee president observes, "offer a diversity of educational experiences and complement opportunities for higher education in nonprivate schools." Their existence, with their differing institutional characters, gives students a freer choice of the kind of education they want and the kind of setting in which they seek it. Their sponsors have a choice of the kind of education they wish to support. Varied as public colleges are, they do not present the range of life-styles that can be found in the private sector. An obvious case in point is the ethical orientation, often religious although not always denominational, of many of the private colleges.

An educational institution shapes more than intellect; intellectual and ethical learning, and cognitive and affective learning are inseparable. Students today will not settle for skills alone, as they tell us emphatically when they complain of the "irrelevance" of present programs, when they ask for curricular emphasis on contemporary problems and issues, and when they describe the impersonality of some educational programs. Their proposals for reform may sometimes be naive and superficial, but they are not wrong in asking for an educational experience that will enable them to gain insight into the relationship between social responsibility and individual development and which will enable them to formulate general convictions about the meaning of life. They are not wrong in bringing to their study a critical attitude toward our society and its institutions and the zeal to improve them—including the colleges and universities. They are not wrong in seeking values as well as marketable skills.

Some of the private colleges, following a tradition in higher education, devote themselves more consciously, more deliberately, and more

systematically, than public institutions to the education of the whole man, to affective as well as cognitive learning. Many of the representatives of the private colleges participating in this study emphasize this point:

> The role of private colleges in general is to provide their own distinctive, legitimate emphases which are not usually found in the state institutions.
>
> . . . It is expected that social values, character, and an understanding of man's purpose in life will receive emphasis.
>
> Private colleges are . . . free to present the importance of moral and spiritual values in the development of human wisdom and in the real fulfillment of a man's life and his relationship with his fellowman in a free society.

The frequently expressed intention and ability of the private colleges to give equal emphasis to affective learning and cognitive learning are reflected both by the fact that many private colleges are church-sponsored or church-related and by the advantage of their relatively small size. This point is reiterated in comments made by their representatives, as is seen in the following statement of one president about his college:

> It is like many other small colleges and shares whatever distinction the small college has in the contemporary American educational environment. We try to take advantage of our small size by emphasizing those kinds of programs which have the capacity to speak to individual needs. We like to think that all of our . . . students have a greater opportunity to become intimately acquainted with each other and with the faculty and staff than would be true in a larger campus environment. Part of our distinctiveness, therefore, has to do with our sincere dedication to a belief that education is interrelation and that the greater the possibilities of interrelation the more likely are we to realize those goals which we believe to be desirable. All of our faculty members know each other and are committed to the aims and directions of the college which evolve from their knowledge of each other and interaction with each other. Students are involved on all committees of the faculty and are free to attend all faculty meetings. Since we are committed to an open educational community, such openness can best be achieved, we believe, in our small setting with our small student body.
>
> We are committed to the education of the "whole" individual. This means that we seek to fulfill a responsibility to stu-

dent co-curricular and extra-curricular activities which is of equal importance to our responsibilities in the academic areas. While we encourage student freedom and responsibility, we accept our responsibility to provide leadership. . . .

To summarize, . . . we believe that our distinctiveness lies in our size. While we aspire to be somewhat bigger . . . , we do not want to get so big that the kind of community we aspire to become might not be possible. We want our faculty to know our students; we want our students to know our faculty; we want our students to know each other; we want the administration to be a dynamic part of the educational experience that interinvolvement permits. I believe that this concept of education can be more readily realized in the small college than in the large, and is probably of greater concern to the private college than to the public—since the public college must accept a greater responsibility to the entire tax-supporting community than the private college.

Partly because of their freedom from the pressures that tend toward uniformity and standardization in some aspects of public education (e.g., funding formulas, cost analyses, common reporting procedures, and the administrative requirements of large size), private institutions can more easily invent or adopt innovative educational programs than can public institutions. Whether they do or not may depend more on the school than on its sources of support. A representative of one institution observes that private institutions "could be pacesetters in the development of new patterns of education." A report on the academic calendar in *Tennessee Higher Education* seems to suggest that changes are more likely in the private colleges:

> Twenty-five institutions are presently operating on a semester system, making it the prevailing calendar in Tennessee colleges. Nineteen institutions are using the traditional quarter system. Some interesting variations are appearing across the state in private institutions. Lambuth College for the first time is on a 14-4-14 schedule, with the first term concluding before the Christmas holidays. Students will enroll in four courses during the fourteen-week terms and one during the "January Interim." Maryville College continues with a ten-week term, followed by a four-week interim term, then two more ten-week terms. Students normally carry three academic subjects during the ten-week terms; the four-week interim providing study-in-depth on a single subject. Southwestern at Memphis provides still another option with two terms of twelve weeks with a third term of six weeks.

The president of Lambuth College uses the same illustration to make the same point and also to show that what may seem to be a mere change in calendar may reflect real changes in the educational program:

> Private colleges have greater independence and freedom to experiment with new educational concepts and programs. Lambuth College . . . is presently among less than two hundred colleges in America . . . which are experimenting with a new calendar and a revised curriculum that emphasizes "person centered" education. This type of educational experience does not attempt to fit all students into a few pre-determined molds. This program which is often referred to as a "4-1-4" program emphasizes independent study and new types of learning experiences during the "January Interim."
>
> Vast educational institutions that are part of a statewide system of higher education are not flexible enough to make changes and innovations without long, arduous negotiations and universal acceptance.

It is a truism of higher education that college attendance increases when colleges are located where the people live. Not unnaturally, clusters of private colleges have grown up in and around the metropolitan areas of Tennessee. There are 10 in Davidson County, 6 in Shelby County, 2 in Hamilton, and 2 in Knox. The rest of the private colleges are scattered throughout the state, and many serve communities in which there are no public colleges.

The private colleges and universities serve their immediate areas in different proportions and in different ways. Half their students come from Tennessee, but percentages ranged in 1968-69 from 10.3 per cent in one junior college to 97.4 per cent in another, in which 91.9 per cent came from the county in which it is located. One 4-year college draws 76.1 per cent of its students from the state and 50 per cent from the local county. Many young people of Tennessee are given the opportunity for higher education, or the incentive to seek it, only because there are private colleges nearby. President Herbert Y. Livesay describes this role of Lincoln Memorial University:

> Lincoln Memorial University, since its inception in 1897, has been an "opportunity" college. By its very location in Central Appalachia—a less affluent area of our state and country —and by one of the philosophies of its Charter: " . . . to make education possible to the children of the humble, common people . . . ," it has endeavored through workshops, grants, scholarships and other means to afford a college education opportu-

nity to many who quite likely would not have had that all-important chance.

Geographically and topographically, the area in which Lincoln Memorial is situated (and where the college offers greater service to the people) is somewhat remote and inaccessible to other institutes of higher learning. Hence, the very location of the college lends itself to providing educational opportunities to many young men and women who otherwise undoubtedly might not receive a college education.

Should Lincoln Memorial suddenly cease to exist, it would behoove the state of Tennessee (in fairness to the people of the Lincoln Memorial region) to immediately provide a campus, physical facilities, faculty and staff, and continuing educational opportunities for the people that Lincoln Memorial serves.

Lincoln Memorial has a substantial investment in land, physical facilities, equipment, personnel, and good will. In essence, the institution serves as a four-year community college.

Similar statements could be made about other private colleges. Of all of them it can be said that if they did not exist, Tennessee would be under obligation to provide other educational opportunities for the aspiring youth of the state.

The private colleges and universities of Tennessee provide undergraduate, graduate, vocational, and professional education for about 35,000 students, half of them residents of Tennessee. They provide the only opportunity for collegiate education for some students. Many of their graduates, whether of Tennessee origin or not, remain in Tennessee and there live their fruitful lives. The private colleges give the people of Tennessee educational options that the public sector alone could not provide. In case of need, they could be additional safeguards of academic freedom and integrity. They make possible educational experiment and innovation not so likely to occur in the public sector. They contribute to the pluralism which is a traditional strength of American higher education and which is obviously appropriate to our pluralistic society. They also make a very significant contribution to the economy of the state and save it considerable sums.

3 The Economic Importance of the Private Colleges

The contribution of the private colleges to the economy of the state is difficult to determine.

The number and kind of degrees awarded by the private colleges and universities of Tennessee can be reported. In 1967-68 these institutions granted more than 6,000 degrees—42 per cent of the degrees granted in the state, although they had only 33.8 per cent of the college enrollment. Of these, 5,207 were bachelor's degrees; 672 were master's; and 147 were doctorates. An estimate can be made of the number of graduates of private colleges and universities who live and work in Tennessee; it is not possible, however, to estimate the dollar value of different degrees to the individuals who hold them. A recent United Business Service Report states that "the average college graduate earns some $200,000 more during his working lifetime than the youth having just a high school diploma." He pays more taxes, too. But one still cannot estimate the importance of the private colleges to the economy of the state.

The colleges and universities participating in this study were asked to report the present location of alumni of the class of 1960 along with their occupations. Many could not provide this information. But Vanderbilt University, for example, reported that from that single class of a decade ago 72 engineers, 25 lawyers, 17 physicians, 19 clergymen, 19 nurses, and 185 "others" are residents of Tennessee today. The information is not available for graduates of George Peabody College for Teachers, the largest teacher education institution, nor for a number of other colleges with teacher education programs; but from the single class of 1960 the colleges reporting know of 274 teachers who are residents of Tennessee. The colleges know of 60 clergymen contributed to

the state of Tennessee by that class, 43 lawyers, 88 engineers, and 187 businessmen.

How can their economic value be estimated? How can one estimate the economic value to the state, or the even more important social value, of a physician, a nurse, a lawyer, an engineer, a social worker, a clergyman, or for that matter an educated citizen? What difference would it make to Tennessee if it were suddenly deprived of all the physicians and nurses who have been educated at Meharry and Vanderbilt, of all the teachers and school administrators who have been educated at Peabody and the many liberal arts colleges with programs of teacher education? What would it mean to the state if it lost not only these but all the other people who attended private colleges and universities in Tennessee or for that matter elsewhere? It would cost the state, for example, 4 of its congressmen and 52 of its state legislators. But these hypothetical questions can only be answered by saying that to lose these people, or not to have had them, would be socially and economically catastrophic. It would be almost equally catastrophic if the state were to be deprived of the future graduates of these colleges. That *could* happen.

There are other more measurable ways in which the private colleges are important to the economy of the state. In 1968-69 the private colleges and universities spent nearly $50 million for teaching, research, public service, and other general expenses. Their total expenditures were more than $125 million. They employed 3,407 faculty members and many hundreds of other people. Private higher education was not the smallest "industry" in the state. Even a small college may be one of the largest employers in a small community.

The private colleges provided nearly $5 million of student aid from federal funds and other outside sources and more than $4 million from institutional funds—$3,611,335 for scholarships and fellowships and $618,623 for work-study programs. In 1968-69 they awarded 6,909 scholarships and fellowships and 6,755 loans, and they provided 5,973 on-campus jobs and 1,648 off-campus jobs for their students. Since many students receive more than one kind of assistance, one cannot say that they gave aid to the 21,285 students to which these figures total; but since tuition charges almost never cover the full cost of education, in a sense the private colleges gave substantial aid to *all* their students —35,000 of them.

The private colleges attract to the state about 17,500 out-of-state

students each year. Typical charges for tuition, room, and board total $1,700 or more a year for each student. If each out-of-state student spent only $300 a year for his personal expenses, they would still be putting approximately $35 million into the Tennessee economy.

The other half of the students are residents of Tennessee. The state of Tennessee appropriates about $1,150 a year for each student in its public colleges and universities. On this basis, in operating costs alone, with no reference to the capital outlays that would be necessary to accommodate an additional 35,000 students in public institutions, one may calculate that the private colleges saved the state of Tennessee more than $40 million in 1968-69, half that if the state felt obligated to provide educational opportunities only for Tennessee residents.

In 1968 the University of Chattanooga as a private institution provided education for 2,503 students at no cost to the state. In 1969-70 the state appropriated $3,052,000 for operating expenditures of its successor institution, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

The private colleges and universities not only relieved the state of operating costs for the education of 35,000 (or half that many) students, but also relieved it of the obligation to provide facilities for the education of these students. The plants and equipment of the private colleges have a combined book value of more than $263 million. Their replacement cost is higher. For example, 2 institutions which give a book value of about $15 million each for their plants and equipment agree that replacement would cost $25 million each. Others make similar estimates. In addition, the colleges have endowments totaling $190 million and other assets totaling $47 million. They have libraries totaling more than 3 million volumes. During the next decade they project capital outlays of $122 million for academic buildings, nearly $65 million for dormitories and apartments, and nearly $53 million for space for auxiliary services—a total of $240 million. Although these estimates of future expenditures are perhaps colored by hopes and aspirations that may not be realized, the existing assets are real and of great public value. They are resources that the state should not ignore in its long-range plans for the education of its young people. If the private colleges did not exist, it would cost more than the $263 million book value of their present plants and equipment to replace them. Approximately $400 million would not be an unreasonable estimate. Of course, the 36 colleges would not be built if they did not exist. But if they did not exist, it would cost the state from $50 to $60 million

to build new educational facilities for the 17,500 Tennessee residents who attend them.

Business and industry count "good will" an asset. That value of the private colleges and universities is inestimable.

4 | The Financial Future of the Private Colleges

Having examined the scope and the variety of the private colleges in Tennessee, the special contributions made by the private colleges, and their economic importance to the state, we look now at their present financial condition, the reasons for that condition, the techniques being used to finance these colleges, and the implications of these techniques.

The financial difficulties of private colleges have been well publicized in newspapers and magazines, and by television commercials asking for donations to the "college of your choice." Private colleges all across the country, even the most affluent ones, are in serious financial difficulty. Why? What are the causes, and what can be done to solve the problem?

The chief sources of income of private colleges are tuition and fees, federal grants and contracts, income from endowments, and gifts—for capital outlay or for operating expenses. What has happened to these sources?

THE INCOME PROBLEM

The income derived from endowment has become, in recent years, a less important source of funds for private colleges. The issue, simply stated, is that the days of Rockefeller and Carnegie are over, and few major endowment gifts are to be expected. Indeed, the private colleges in Tennessee, with the exception of a select few, are modestly endowed, and they must rely on student fees for the preponderance of their income. And stable endowment income represents a declining percentage of increasing budgets. Returns from endowment vary, and the most expert management cannot increase them much.

Endowment funds are not likely to increase as rapidly as in the past, partly because of changing college policies. The financial exigencies of

829

recent years have forced colleges to seek gifts for capital outlay—a named library building is an attractive monument—and for operating expenses. Annual fund drives help to pay bills but they do not build endowments.

Why the reduced importance of endowment? One explanation, of course, is inflation. According to Seymour Harris, a noted economist, endowments have lost up to one-third of their original value during the past 25 years. Economists commenting on the problems of endowment recommend annual giving rather than tying up great sums in perpetual trusts. The foundations, one of the major sources of endowment, also frown upon perpetual trusts. Colleges, therefore, must seek new sources for funds to maintain or improve their positions.

Tuition income is a complex subject, involving as it does the cost of the educational product, the ability of the public to pay, and the traditional pressure to maintain low tuition. Private college tuition charges have skyrocketed within the past few years, a well-known and tragic reminder of the importance of tuition income for the private schools. College administrators realize, however, that high tuition charges cannot be the panacea for their problems.

Dr. Howard R. Bowen, President of the State University of Iowa and former President of Grinnell College, comments on the tuition problem in a 1968 study, *Finances of Higher Education,* published by the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education:

> The tuition question as it relates to private institutions is especially complex. They have long charged higher tuitions than public universities. . . . They have been able to attract students, despite higher fees, because they have served special constituencies and have in many instances offered education, services, and amenities different from those available in public institutions. To their great credit, private institutions have valiantly kept their doors open to students of modest income by means of scholarships and loans. . . .
>
> My conclusion is that substantial differences in tuitions between private and public institutions are practically feasible, socially justifiable, and economically necessary. So long as low-tuition public institutions provide an alternative to students of modest means, no one can claim to be seriously damaged if he pays more to attend a private institution. However, . . . high tuitions are not an equitable method of finance. If carried to an extreme, they would tend to limit private colleges and universities to the more affluent students and make them class institutions—a fate to be avoided at all costs. The case for keeping tuition down is valid in the private as well as in the public sec-

tor, and private institutions should not regress from their present commendable efforts to accommodate students from low-income families.

Increases in tuition require larger and larger allowances for student aid and at some point are self-defeating. "We have already priced ourselves out of the Tennessee market," says one Tennessee college president. The enrollment in his college for each of the past four years has been as follows: 561, 602, 611, 581. And it does seem to be pricing itself out of the Tennessee market; the percentage of Tennessee residents enrolled has declined from 30.9 per cent in 1960 to 12.2 per cent in 1969.

This college is not alone in its pricing problem. The increases in tuition during the past decade have been startling. Among Tennessee's private 4-year colleges, increases range from 75 per cent to 300 per cent. Nineteen of 23 colleges reporting tuition rates for 1960 and 1969 have more than doubled their tuition charges during the period, as have 2 of the 4 junior colleges reporting and 4 of the 5 graduate institutions. Three institutions have found it necessary to raise tuition by more than 200 per cent during the period. Charges for room and board have also been increased by percentages ranging from 40 to 104 per cent.

The critical issue is not whether raising tuition will solve the financial problems of the institutions, but whether or not the increases will make it impossible for a large number of students to attend private schools and whether or not this is in the public interest. High cost can hamper the achievement of institutional objectives such as strong geographical and socioeconomic distribution in the student body.

Another aspect of the tuition problem is the necessity for increasing student assistance in the form of scholarships to offset the increased financial need caused by increased costs. That is to say, if all of the increased revenue derived from a tuition increase were available for faculty salaries and other expenses, the additional income might go a long way toward solving some financial problems. A portion of the increased revenue *must* be siphoned off for student aid, however; and the higher the cost, the higher the percentage of students who will need aid. The greater the number of students receiving aid, the smaller the impact of a tuition increase on the budget.

The third and last source of income for colleges is the money donated for current operations, by friends, alumni, businesses, and foundations. Gifts as a source of support are extremely important to private colleges and universities. "Other gifts, grants, and contracts" listed by

Tennessee private institutions totalled $16.6 million in 1968-69. Obviously, the colleges must continue and intensify their fund-raising efforts. Just as federal agencies have new priorities for expenditure of funds, so have the great foundations. Other fields such as urban poverty, rural poverty, the problems of population, the changing mix of the population, disaffected youth and the disaffected aging, and environmental control all compete for the charitable dollar as well as the public dollar. Foundation support of higher education is decreasing. For example, in 1965 foundations gave $357 million to higher education, whereas in 1967 they gave only $289 million.

Since World War II, the federal government has become an important source of funds for private colleges—for student aid, for support of research, for the financing of self-liquidating facilities, and for a variety of other things. In 1968-69 Tennessee private colleges and universities received more than $16 million from the federal government for research and instructional programs, and almost $5 million for student aid. Of the $16 million, 85 per cent—nearly $14 million—went to two research-oriented Ph.D. granting institutions. Federal research contracts do not mean much to small liberal arts colleges. Throughout the country they tend to concentrate in a few institutions. In Massachusetts, for example, 71 per cent of federal research funds allocated to private institutions went to Harvard and MIT.

To a university, research contracts have a great value. They enable it to attract and hold able faculty, to build strong graduate programs, and to support graduate students engaged in research. But they do not solve its financial problems. If the contracts include adequate allowances for overhead, which they seldom do, the university does no more than break even.

Naturally there is agitation for more general federal support for higher education. A 1969 report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and a recent Carnegie Commission report urge increased federal support for higher education. However, federal support of higher education is not growing at a rapid rate and some programs have been sharply curtailed. Private colleges and universities may eventually receive more support and less restricted support from the federal government, but the needs are immediate, and short-term prospects are not good.

According to an IRS report cited in a Massachusetts study, average charitable contributions of people with adjusted incomes of $10,000 or more declined from $745 in 1960 to $545 in 1966. A slowing economy and proposed tax "reforms" are not likely to encourage more or

larger individual gifts since a growing economy and a propitious tax did not do so. Moreover, individual donors may also establish new priorities.

THE EXPENSE PROBLEM

The income derived from the sources previously mentioned must be spent to purchase goods and services. The expense side of the balance sheet is traditionally broken into three main categories: (1) educational and general, (2) auxiliary services, and (3) student aid. Because auxiliary services are expected to pay for themselves, this section will deal largely with the educational and general costs, and student aid expenditures.

Colleges and universities have surprisingly little control over their expenditures. Most of their expenses are fixed and their funds are committed. They can make few significant economies. They have even less control over their revenues; most of their income depends not on their own decisions but on the decisions of others.

Faculty salaries loom as the most important item under this category. Within recent years, faculty salaries have, of necessity, increased dramatically, and they are now approaching respectability. The issue here is not the adequacy or inadequacy of salaries, but the budgetary impact of the higher salaries the colleges must pay to maintain and to improve their present positions. Recognizing the need for increased salaries and the limitations of endowment income to meet that need, the budgetary alternative is increased tuition and/or more gifts which may be applied to these costs. Nearly every tuition increase announced in recent years presents the need for increased faculty salaries as the rationale. Another factor influencing faculty salaries as a percentage of total costs is that of the large increase in the number of faculty members necessary to teach the increased number of students enrolled in colleges.

It appears that the impact of faculty salaries on the budget stems from three main factors: (1) an increase in the average salary to meet rising costs of living; (2) an increase in the number of faculty members to provide the education needed to meet the requirements of an increasingly complex society; and (3) the need of private colleges to meet the competition for faculty of new or expanding state schools and private industry.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) makes an annual study of the "Economic Status of the Profession." It asks

colleges and universities throughout the country to report minimum and average salaries of their faculties, by rank, and minimum and average compensations (i.e., salary plus fringe benefits). It then rates the colleges according to scale. The 1968 scale based on average compensation (salary plus fringe benefits for nine months) was as follows:

TABLE 1

AAUP AVERAGE COMPENSATION SCALE, 1968-69

	AA	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*
Professor	$27,000	$21,500	$17,000	$13,600	$10,900	$9,000	$8,000
Assoc. Prof.	15,500	13,500	11,900	10,400	9,000	7,900	7,200
Ass't. Prof.	12,000	10,700	9,560	8,580	7,760	7,100	6,600
Instructor	9,000	8,300	7,680	7,140	6,680	6,300	6,000

Response to the Association's request for information is, of course, not mandatory, and many institutions do not report. Not surprisingly, those which do not report are often among those with lower scales of compensation.

For the year 1968-69, 19 of the private colleges and universities of Tennessee were queried for the AAUP study. Five of the 19 institutions did not report. One, Vanderbilt University, had an A rating for average compensation for all ranks except instructor, for which it had an AA rating. It also had A and AA rating for its preclinical medical school, which is separately rated. Of the other 13 Tennessee private institutions which reported in the study, 4 were rated C, 7 were rated D, and 2 were rated E. One college which did not report for 1968-69 was rated D in the preceding year. One college which was rated G reported an average faculty salary of $4,175 in 1966-67.

In 1968-69 the average compensation of college and university faculty members of all ranks in 961 institutions reporting to the AAUP by rank was $12,951. In Tennessee only Vanderbilt and the University of the South reported average compensation above the national average, $15,672 and $13,075. Other private institutions in Tennessee reported average compensations ranging from $8,401 to $12,789. Of the 14 colleges reporting, 8 reported average compensation below $10,000; 7 of them reported average salaries below $9,000 and the eighth an average salary of $9,031. Some of the colleges which did not report and others which were not queried by the AAUP pay even lower salaries. The public colleges of Tennessee also lag, but not quite so much. Of

the 9 included in the survey, one was rated B (The University of Tennessee Medical School), 6 were rated C, and 2 were rated D.

Clearly then, costs for compensation of faculty and other staff constitute a special problem in Tennessee, for current salaries are not competitive, either nationally or within the southeastern region, and must rise at more than the common rate if the aspiration to excellence is to be realized.

In a recent study by Baumol and Heim, it is pointed out that salaries account for from 60 to 70 per cent of the total operating expenses of a college, and that this percentage cannot be reduced very much. Education, they argue, differs from economic activity in the role human effort plays in it. In manufacturing, new technologies have enabled industry to increase productivity per man hour steadily and regularly. Although new technologies have enabled colleges and universities to improve the quality of teaching, they have done little to increase productivity. In teaching, increasing class size has resulted in significant increases in productivity, but at what cost in quality we do not know. In any event, the private colleges make much of the value of the intimacy which depends on small classes. They should, of course, do everything they can, consistent with quality, to increase their productivity, but neither they nor any of the institutions of higher or secondary education—public or private—are likely to be able to match increases in productivity in other parts of the economy.

For the past eight years, faculty compensations the country over have increased at an average rate of 6.5 per cent a year. There is no compelling reason to think that they will increase at any lower rate in the future, although Bowen suggests that they might. They have, of course, increased in Tennessee as well. But current salary scales of Tennessee colleges indicate that they must increase more rapidly than the regional average, for at present some Tennessee colleges are in effect subsidized by their faculties. Some colleges with modest surpluses would have deficits if their salaries were competitive with colleges in the southeastern United States; those with deficits would have larger ones.

The third traditional expense is the amount which must be allocated to student aid, either in the form of gift assistance or loans. This expense item also responds to the problems of pricing because with each tuition increase the amount allotted to student aid must be increased. Student aid is accepted as a legitimate expense because it has never been felt that ability to pay should determine the college-bound cohort. Indeed, the oldest form of student aid is the low salaries received by professors. The amount of student aid will vary from school to school

and depend largely upon such variables as the tuition costs, whether the student body is largely residential or commuter, and the geographical and socioeconomic composition of the student body.

How valid is the statement that Tennessee's private colleges have "priced themselves out of the market"? This is a difficult question to answer.

In 1950, total enrollment in institutions of higher education was equally divided. By 1960, the percentages had shifted to 59 per cent in public institutions and 41 per cent in private colleges. In the fall of 1969, the percentages were 74 in public schools and 26 in private schools, and the trend is continuing since in that same year freshman enrollment was 77 per cent in public and 23 per cent in private schools.

Surely, high cost is a factor contributing to the decline in private school enrollment. The average income in Tennessee, after deducting federal income taxes, is $7,325, and according to a nationally known financial need analysis system, a typical two-parent, two-child family could contribute approximately $640 toward college expenses. It is quite clear that the "average" Tennessee family can hardly afford public colleges and cannot afford the higher costs of the private colleges. Clearly, as private college costs increase still further, the number of families able to afford those costs declines.

THE INFLATION PROBLEM

No description of expenses would be complete without a discussion of the insidious impact of inflation on educational institutions. Colleges, by their very nature, are more susceptible to an erosion of their purchasing power by the inflationary trend in our economy. Dr. Bowen alludes to the problem when he says, "In every industry in which increases in productivity come more slowly than in the economy as a whole, cost per unit of product must be expected to increase relative to costs in general."

More dollars are required to purchase essentials, and the sources of dollars have not kept pace with prices. The result is an ever-widening differential between income and expenses. And as the differential becomes greater, the need for additional "eroded" dollars becomes even more critical.

Inflationary pressures have made it necessary for schools to pay higher prices for all commodities and services. It is common to find that a building increases in cost during actual construction because labor and material costs rise so rapidly. Colleges have little choice but

to purchase their products on the open market, and the slight advantage they have as tax-exempt organizations provides little relief. They have been forced to raise their prices for auxiliary services such as room and board and health services to maintain a break-even point. The colleges are caught in a vise of rising costs and a variety of pressures to keep prices within reach of the students they wish to serve.

Dr. Bowen continues the exposition of the inflationary problems they will face:

> Faculty salaries have been rising by 5 to 7 per cent a year and are expected to continue to rise, though possibly at a slower rate, for as far ahead as the eye can see. Non-academic salaries are expected to keep pace with comparable wages and salaries in industry and government which means average annual increases of 3 per cent or more. The information explosion requires even greater outlays for library books just to keep up with the procession, and the advance of science and technology requires ever more complicated equipment. Computers grow where adding machines used to be, electron microscopes replace optical ones, and nuclear reactors supplant test tubes. New expensive disciplines, some of which did not exist a decade ago, must be added to the curriculum if the college or university is not to fall behind. Land costs near campuses are going up astronomically and costs of construction are rising inexorably year by year. Also the costs of purchased goods and services such as fuel, electricity, telephone service, stationery, travel, etc. have a way of creeping up even when there is no "official" inflation.

Tennessee private colleges and universities spent about $43.5 million in 1968-69 for activities which Bowen classifies as "educational and general expenses." Although Bowen's projections are highly speculative and although he is concerned primarily with complex major universities with large percentages of graduate students—the most expensive education—he observes that "those of us who are born optimists would do well to remember that most previous projections of this kind have *underestimated* future requirements of educational institutions." It is not unreasonable to conclude that educational and general costs of Tennessee private colleges will double during the coming decade even if their enrollments remain the same and they do not undertake any additional steps to improve the quality of their programs.

The study on which these observations are based offers no hope of stabilizing costs of higher education.

> There is no reason to expect any slowing down in the rate of improvement of productivity elsewhere in the economy. . . . Hence wages and standards of living in the remainder of the economy will undoubtedly continue to rise, and with that rise the pressures for increasing compensation levels for faculty members and administrators will go on. But, with no real prospects as yet in sight for increases in productivity in the technology of higher education, the consequences are inescapable. Costs of higher education will continue to outstrip at a compounded rate the costs that are typical of the economy as a whole. . . . The costs of higher education must continue to climb; and there can be no level of financing which constitutes the end of the task.

Dr. Bowen makes the same point, but even more sharply. He demonstrates that although rising student enrollments in private as in public higher education have, of course, accounted for part of the enormous increases in expenditures for higher education, the more significant figure is the cost per student. Over a period of 18 years, costs *per student* in major universities have risen by an average compounded rate of 7.4 per cent annually. Between 1956 and 1965 costs per student increased about 8.0 per cent a year while the economy-wide index of costs increased at an average annual rate of only 2.0 per cent, and he concludes that "current cost per student ought to be expected to increase at a rate of something like 7.5 per cent per year if these institutions are to meet their responsibilities."

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Each year colleges perform a financial ritual called "balancing the budget for next year." The income, expense, and inflationary problems discussed previously make this balancing act most difficult. When it is clear that projected income and expenses are out of line, colleges utilize a number of techniques to bring them together.

1. Increasing tuition charges is one technique. A typical college in Tennessee reports that tuition charges have risen from $440 in 1960 to $1,225 in 1970—an increase of 178 per cent. Charges for room and board have increased from $470 in 1960 to $800 in 1968 and $960 in 1970—an increase of 96 per cent. The college projects increases in tuition to $1,600 in 1975 and to $2,000 in 1980, and in room and board charges to $1,225 in 1975 and $1,565 in 1980. Its president predicts, however, that even if these increases are assumed and even if the college

grows from 581 students in 1969 to 800 students in 1975 and 1,000 in 1980, it will still be "exceedingly difficult to balance income and expense." Past increases in tuition have not resulted in balanced budgets.

2. Deferring needed maintenance has of necessity become a second technique for balancing a budget or reducing a deficit. But is deferred maintenance an adequate response to the problem? The Tennessee college president who has been quoted reports:

> By rigorous pruning and control and by reasonably realistic projections for next year we have been able to project a balanced budget for the 1970-71 year. However, this balanced budget is based on increased tuition charges of roughly $200 which will raise our tuition to about $1,400. When room and board charges are added, we are close to the $2,500 figure for the year. We have already priced ourselves out of the Tennessee market; we may be pricing ourselves out of other markets. We believe that we have reached the absolute upper limit of overall charges if we are to remain at all competitive.

The projected balanced budget, let us note, is contingent on "rigorous pruning and control," which surely may be interpreted to imply continuing deferral of maintenance, further postponement of necessary capital outlays, and continuing stringent economy. These may be very expensive in the long run; deferred costs are rising costs especially during a period of inflation.

A 1968 New York State study includes detailed analysis of 11 institutions in that state, "large and small, rich and poor, upstate and New York City, sectarian and non-sectarian." The study reports as follows:

> In nearly all cases the physical plants of the institutions surveyed are inadequately maintained. The backlog of deferred maintenance is rising annually.
>
> Few institutions have preventive maintenance programs; thus minor problems develop into major repair needs. Because of deferred maintenance the estimated cost of building and utilities renovation and removal of building code violations at ten institutions adds up to a shocking total of $14.4 million. While the institutions are eager to undertake modernization programs, they lack adequate funds to do so.

For all the private institutions in New York, the Select Committee estimates deferred maintenance at a combined total of $45 to $55 million and observes that the cost of removing the burden of deferred maintenance over a five-year period would be approximately $9 to $11

million a year. Meanwhile, of course, there would be new maintenance problems. A Massachusetts study estimates deferred maintenance in the private colleges of that state at $14 million.

Deferred maintenance, of course, means inferior current maintenance. The New York State report continues:

> Housekeeping is generally far below acceptable standards and is declining each year. Because staffs are inadequate both in numbers and in quality, broken plumbing is not repaired, paint is peeling, and other obvious needs are overlooked. Daily cleaning chores are performed—wastebaskets are emptied and blackboards are washed—but windows are rarely cleaned, and floors often go unwaxed for long periods.
>
> Very little long-term planning is evident with respect to physical facilities; most projects are handled on a demand basis.

We are not able to estimate the magnitude of deferred maintenance in the private colleges of Tennessee, but we think it unlikely that individually they are better off in current maintenance or in deferred maintenance than the colleges of New York and Massachusetts.

3. In addition to deferring maintenance, a third common but equally shortsighted practice for achieving a balanced budget is that of reducing the number of faculty members and, as a by-product, increasing the student-faculty ratio. This practice is not peculiar to Tennessee either. A Texas study comments on the "rather prevalent practice" among some private institutions "of balancing their budgets by economizing on faculty." In Oregon, according to the study made in that state, 10 or 12 private colleges showed deficits in 1967-68. One of the 2 which did not show deficits benefited from substantial "contributed services." The other achieved a balanced budget by increasing the student-faculty ratio (19 to 1, compared to a state average in the private colleges of 13.25 to 1) and by lowering salaries, which were already low. In Tennessee private colleges, exclusive of Vanderbilt and Meharry (and other medical schools), the ratio of students to faculty was 13.5 to 1 in 1968-69.

4. As a last resort, private colleges adopt deficit financing as, they hope, a short-term expedient. One small college in Tennessee reported income of $1,386,036 in 1968-69 and expenditures of $1,555,214—a deficit of $187,178. This college has had deficits for four years (including the current year) ranging from $131,000 to $187,000. The cumulative deficit for the four years is approximately $498,000. With

an annual budget of approximately $1.5 million, such deficits cannot be taken lightly nor be continued very long. Moreover, the deficit has been kept from growing much larger by various other expedients, such as those already described, which must be temporary and which may prove to be expensive in the end.

The college used here as a case in point is not alone in its deficit. Fourteen other Tennessee private colleges reported 1968-69 deficits ranging from $13,289 to $893,451 and totalling almost $3.5 million. Moreover, 8 colleges reported deficits in their auxiliary services. It is not unreasonable to assume that these colleges also live with deferred maintenance, postponed capital outlays, and the threat or actuality of curtailed programs. As observed in Chapter 1, they also live with hopes for rapidly rising enrollments which must be regarded as unrealistic unless they can anticipate new sources of support for students and new sources of funds for operations and capital outlay.

Obviously, deficit financing which erodes endowment cannot be a solution to the financial problem. The technique must be viewed as an expedient, and a dangerous one at that.

Among those colleges which have so far avoided deficits, none were prepared to suggest that future prospects are bright. Fairly typical were the remarks of the president of one Tennessee institution which reported a modest surplus relative to its total budget:

> We . . . have avoided "deficits" in the last two or three years, including the year reported in Section IV (of the questionnaire on which this study is based), by using non-recurring accumulated reserves. On a current basis, measuring operating expenditures against regular income from all sources, we have been running deficits that do not show up in the kinds of information carried by Section IV. I suspect that all of us in private higher education have been engaged in creative improvisation to make budgets balance. We have been using pockets of monies that we have squirreled away for some years. By hard-headed accounting practice I suspect we do not make adequate allowances for depreciation, replacement, and other expenditures that in the business world, and equivalently in public higher education, are provided for. I suspect that especially we have been derelict in putting money into preventive maintenance and deferred maintenance, thus building for ourselves heavy drains in the future for the preservation and restoration of physical plant.

As the Joint Study Committee could not review plant needs, neither could it examine different management policies and accounting proce-

dures in the several institutions. The findings of the New York State study, however, may again sound a warning to Tennessee colleges:

> After appropriate allocations of overhead costs, deficits are consistently encountered in all institutions studied with respect to auxiliary enterprises and, in most institutions, sponsored research and other non-instructional activities.
>
> Over the years most institutions have consistently neglected proper allocation of overhead costs to the various non-instructional activities. In some cases no allocations are made at all. If overhead costs are allocated on a uniformly equitable basis, as was done in the studies undertaken for the Committee, deficits, often substantial, appear consistently in non-instructional areas.
>
> The greatest losses are sustained in auxiliary activities where institutions seem reluctant to charge adequately for services rendered, especially for provision of room and board.

What can we say of the future?

The private colleges of Tennessee estimate their capital needs during the next decade at $240 million. Even if one discounts that projection as reflecting expectations of growth that may not materialize, one must still count on massive need for new facilities. Meanwhile operating costs will continue to rise. Howard R. Bowen states:

> Every educational administrator who attempts to project institutional costs for five or ten years ends up with the gloomy conclusion that they are bound to rise, even if he assumes no price inflation and no qualitative improvement.

But price inflation is a fact and no college should be content not to seek qualitative improvement. The Tennessee private colleges intend to seek it.

It may be wise to repeat the warning that accurate projections of future income and costs for private colleges and universities are not possible. Projections that can be made are not so inaccurate, however, as to be meaningless. They show that the strength of private colleges and universities of Tennessee cannot be maintained without new sources of income.

Perhaps there are ways in which some of the colleges could economize. Perhaps groups of them could effect economies by cooperative efforts. If groups of them pooled relatively small endowments, professional management might be able to increase their yields some-

what. Recent Ford Foundation reports and the example of Yale have led a good many colleges to reexamine their investment policies. Combined purchasing programs might result in some savings. Collaborative educational programs among neighboring colleges, public or private, might result in some savings without loss of quality. The common library of Vanderbilt, Peabody, and Scarritt is a case in point. Some joint appointments or faculty exchanges might help.

But after considering the management improvements that might be accomplished in the colleges they studied, the Massachusetts Committee still concluded that if the private institutions of that state were forced to cope with worsening financial conditions by "internal measures," they would be forced into undesirable actions:

> Curtailment of enrollment growth, limitation of student aid expenditures, continuance of a high rate of tuition growth, and reduction of educational resources available for each student may well be the ultimate result of financial problems in private higher education.
>
> . . . Such actions by the private institutions of higher education would place an increasing moral and financial burden on the public institutions.

That such measures would result in deteriorating quality in their educational programs is obvious. The Joint Study Staff thinks it is unlikely that they would prevent further "worsening" of their financial situation.

The Biennial Report of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission predicts that the public colleges of Tennessee will need from 10 to 13 per cent more money each year during the next five years to accommodate an increasing enrollment. The appropriations for public institutions of higher education in 1969-70 were $86,602,000. The estimated minimum needed for 1974-75 is $149 million and the optimum $175 million. They will need more than that if the private colleges fail.

The Report states:

> We will probably add 36,000 students in the public institutions by 1974-75. . . . In the last three years, the number of freshmen entering the private institutions in Tennessee has declined more than 10 per cent and if tuition in the private colleges continues to rise rapidly we can expect more students to shift from private to public colleges.

If present trends continue, the public institutions will be expanding their capacity to enroll students at the same time that the private col-

leges have unused capacity. Tennessee's private colleges report that they can accommodate over 4,000 more students than are presently enrolled without adding to their physical plant or increasing the number of faculty. If additional faculty members were hired, the private colleges could accommodate almost 6,500 more students with their present physical plant.

It seems senseless and not in the public interest to duplicate existing educational facilities, and prudent use of the taxpayers' dollars suggests that some method be devised to moderate the enrollment trend. It also suggests that the shift in enrollment from private to public schools, attributed to rising tuition differentials, provides Tennessee with a legitimate basis for adopting techniques which have as their goal the full utilization of the total educational resources of the state.

In summary, these salient facts must be considered:

1. Fifteen of the 36 colleges and universities in this study reported deficits in 1968-69. Others avoided deficits by techniques which have an adverse impact upon quality and future solvency.

2. In 1968-69 the private colleges and universities of Tennessee were forced to spend $2 million more than their income.

3. If they could have, they would have spent more. As it is, they have maintained low salary scales and have deferred maintenance, modernization, and necessary capital outlays. This procedure, of course, cannot continue indefinitely.

4. Expenses of these institutions continue to rise faster than income from present sources. Neither in Tennessee nor elsewhere can private colleges and universities solve their financial problems by increasing charges for tuition, room and board, and health services.

5. Although fund-raising efforts have been intensified, the needs of the colleges are not likely to be met by private philanthropy, foundational or individual.

6. The federal government has become an important source of funds for private colleges, but government grants tend to concentrate in a few institutions and the small liberal arts colleges are overlooked by them.

It can only be concluded that unless a new source of revenue is found, the contribution of the private sector to higher education in Tennessee will diminish in scope and deteriorate in quality. Throughout the country, the private colleges are turning to their state governments for assistance, and many states are responding.

5 | What Other States Are Doing

I. VARIETIES OF STATE AID TO PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

In a recent study, *State Support for Private Higher Education,* published by the Southern Regional Education Board, Dr. William H. McFarlane describes representative types of aid to private colleges and also summarizes some recent representative state reports and their recommendations. Most frequently, support of private colleges takes the form of assistance to students who attend them.

STUDENT AID PROGRAMS

A. Guaranteed Loan Programs

Guaranteed loans are the most widespread form of financial aid to students. Although programs are variously administered in the several states, such assistance is coordinated nationally under the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Tennessee has a program, of course, but of limited scope. Many of the banks in Tennessee have not seen fit to take part in this program. Other states have had the same experience. In reference to Georgia, McFarlane says:

> Unfortunately, there are areas where banker participation is light or nonexistent. Hopefully, public awareness and pressures, combined with the bankers' foresight in securing future customers and in providing support to the State's young people, will bring about increased participation in the near future.

Fewer than 3 per cent of the students enrolled in Tennessee colleges and universities have benefited from this program.

A45

B. Service Scholarships or Loan Funds

Some states have programs to assist students who are preparing themselves for occupations in which trained manpower is needed. The state of Maryland, for example, provides competitive scholarships for students attending specified private institutions with approved programs of teacher education. To secure a scholarship, the student must demonstrate financial need, must be a full-time student in a program leading to a Maryland teacher's certificate, and must give bond to teach in Maryland public schools for at least two years after graduation. The contribution of the private colleges in Tennessee to teacher education will be discussed later. These colleges educate many teachers, and a program like that in Maryland might be helpful to the state. Students of medicine, nursing, and other health professions are obvious groups for whom special service scholarships might be desirable. Library science is perhaps another.

C. Scholarship Programs

The most frequent form of state assistance to private colleges is by means of scholarships or grants to students who cannot attend college without aid. Twenty states have such programs, and they are being proposed in other states. They are designed to help needy resident students who attend colleges (public or private) within the state. Some do not restrict aid to students who choose in-state colleges: colleges in Tennessee, for example, have some students who hold Pennsylvania scholarships. Nineteen of the programs (the twentieth went into effect after the report was prepared) are described in detail in *An Examination of State Efforts in Removing Financial Barriers to Postsecondary Education,* a report by Dr. Joseph D. Boyd, Executive Director of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. The following summary is based upon his report. Boyd, like McFarlane, distinguishes two kinds of student-aid programs: categorical and general.

1. Categorical Programs

Categorical programs are designed to benefit certain groups in the population or to induce students to train for certain occupations, as in the Maryland teacher-education program. Population groups for whom programs exist include veterans, their children, blind or otherwise handicapped students, members of certain minority groups, and

many others. Occupational training for which categorical aid is available in various states includes medicine, nursing, dentistry, teaching, optometry, pharmacy, library science, law, and engineering.

Many categorical programs ignore the question of need. The aid provided is available to all students in the specified category. In Illinois, for example, Boyd indicates that 42,000 students (37 per cent of the full-time undergraduates in public 4-year colleges) enjoyed full tuition waivers under various types of categorical aid. That this enabled many to attend college who could not otherwise have done so is unquestionable. That others who could afford to pay standard tuition were given waivers is also unquestionable. Whether aid should be given where there is no demonstrable need is an important policy question. So is the question of whether need alone should be enough. In comprehensive or general programs of student assistance, the trend recently has been to consider need alone, although many states also have competitive scholarship programs where both need and special competence are required.

2. General Scholarship Programs

The following states have provided for general programs of assistance for students who could not otherwise attend college or could not afford the college of their choice: California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

All of these states have competitive scholarship programs requiring the student to demonstrate special competence as well as need. Some states award honorary scholarships (title without stipend) to students who are intellectually qualified but cannot demonstrate need. Eleven states provide noncompetitive grants requiring only demonstrated need for eligibility. Four have special programs to assist students who choose private colleges. There are other variations.

Tables 2 and 3, reprinted by permission from Boyd's study, summarize the 19 state scholarship programs that were in operation in 1969-70.

The several states have established different maximum awards, ranging in the competitive scholarship programs from $400 to $2,000. Many states, in addition to establishing a maximum, limit awards to the amount of tuition and fees charged by the institution attended.

TABLE 2

COMPREHENSIVE STATE COMPETITIVE PROGRAMS FOR RESIDENTS TO ATTEND PUBLIC OR NONPUBLIC INSTITUTIONS FOR 1969-70

State	*Year Began*	*Maximum Award*	*Total Dollars Appropriated for Awards*	*Number Monetary Awards*	*Average Award*
California	1956	$2,000	$ 11,288,475	13,680	$825
Connecticut	1964	1,000	877,500	1,440	609
Illinois	1958	1,200	12,000,000	17,100	702
Indiana	1966	800	3,080,000	6,550	470
Iowa	1966	800	262,500	400*	656*
Kansas	1963	500	150,000	409	367
Maine	1967	400	61,000	150	407
Maryland	1825*	1,500	2,900,000	7,250	400
Massachusetts	1958	1,025	2,000,000	3,000	667
Michigan	1964	800	7,300,000	16,780	435
Minnesota	1968	800	575,000	960	600
New Jersey	1959	500	6,900,000	17,470	395
New York	1913	1,000	28,800,000	68,000	424
Oregon	1935	500	167,000	477	350
Pennsylvania	1965	800	51,400,000	76,150	675
Rhode Island	1961	1,000	1,500,000	2,000	750
Vermont**	1965	1,000	1,099,255	2,100	523
West Virginia	1968	600	175,000	625	280
Wisconsin	1966	800	750,000	1,925	390
TOTALS OR AVERAGE			$131,285,730	236,466	$555

* Best Estimate.
** Vermont's Program Is Basically Noncompetitive. Only 100 ($100) Freshman Awards Are on a Strictly Competitive Basis.

TABLE 3

SPECIALIZED NONCOMPETITIVE STATE PROGRAMS OF UNDERGRADUATE FINANCIAL GIFT ASSISTANCE FOR 1969-70

State and Program(s)	*Year Began*	*Maximum Award*	*Total Dollars Appropriated for Awards*	*Number Monetary Awards*	*Average Award*
California					
College Opportunity Grant	1969	Tuition & Fees Plus $1,100	$ 1,000,000	1,000	$1,000
Illinois					
Grant Program	1967	$1,200	14,000,000	21,375	655
Iowa					
Tuition Grant for Private Colleges	1969	1,000	1,500,000	1,875*	800*
Michigan					
Tuition Grant	1966	800	5,200,000	7,250	717
Minnesota					
Grant-in-Aid	1969	800	200,000	333	600
New Jersey					
Incentive	1966	500	1,300,000	2,650	490
Tuition Aid Grant	1969	1,000	1,000,000	3,225	310
County College Grant	1969	1,000	250,000	313	800
Educational Opportunity Fund	1968	800*	2,400,000	3,000	800
New York					
Scholar Incentive Assistance	1961	500	30,000,000	195,000	154
Oregon					
Nonpublic College Grant Program	1969	100	648,400	6,484	100
Pennsylvania					
Education Incentive Program	1969	800	500,000	1,250	400
Wisconsin					
Tuition Grant	1965	500	2,200,000	7,585	290
TOTALS			$60,198,400	251,340	$ 240

* Estimate.

Other programs of financial aid to students will likely be established in the near future. The April 1970 issue of *Higher Education in the States* reviews recent and pending state legislation dealing with higher education. It reports a number of proposals. For example, the General Assembly of Georgia passed an amendment, to be submitted to the electorate in 1970, authorizing the General Assembly to provide grants for citizens attending private colleges; a bill has been introduced in the Kentucky General Assembly to provide tuition grants to needy students in private colleges; a Maine legislative order calls for a study of the appropriation of funds for Maine students in private colleges; a North Carolina commission has been directed to study the possibility of aid to students attending both public and private institutions.

OTHER WAYS OF ASSISTING PRIVATE COLLEGES

Although programs of scholarships, grants, and guaranteed loans to students attending private colleges are classified as forms of assistance to such colleges, their financial impact on the colleges is not very great. *New York State and Private Higher Education* (1968 report) indicates that the New York Scholar Incentive Program has served needy students well and has been good for the state, but that it has been of little financial benefit to the colleges. This, of course, was expected and indeed was predicted when the program was initiated. If a student is given a grant to attend college, the college benefits financially only if it can raise its tuition and fees accordingly, or if it can reduce aid given from its own funds, or if it can accept more students without sacrificing the quality of its program and without significant additional outlays for facilities and staff. The first of these options, to increase tuition, defeats the central purpose of programs of student aid. It is in the second and third circumstances that colleges benefit financially from student-aid programs. The private colleges of Tennessee would so benefit because they have inadequate funds of their own for student aid and their facilities are not used to capacity. Dr. McFarlane's report has a word of warning concerning these programs:

> It should not be assumed, however, that larger enrollments at private institutions under student support programs would automatically benefit either the state or those institutions. Since scholarships and other forms of student support are normally calibrated to what the institution charges, and this is normally less than the actual per-student costs for education, a large influx of new enrollments could actually mean larger defi-

> cits rather than balanced budgets. Faced with this situation, some institutions would undoubtedly be tempted merely to raise their fees closer to the level of true costs, thus negating the advantages to the student. . . . If, on the other hand, private institutions involved in state-financed student support programs were to improve their operational efficiency (e.g., by increased faculty-student ratios), to improve space utilization, and to offset price-cost deficits by private fund raising, student support programs could indeed result in balanced budgets and possible margins for needed improvements, while simultaneously decreasing the average per-student costs to the state.

There are more direct ways, however, of assisting private colleges than student-support programs. Some of those described by McFarlane in his published study follow:

A. Tuition-Equalization Program

A state may make direct payments to a private college or university to enable it to reduce tuition and fee charges without loss of income. Pennsylvania has the largest such program. It has three technically private "state-related" universities: Pennsylvania State University, Temple University, and the University of Pittsburgh. Temple and Pittsburgh have only recently come into this category. As private institutions, in the past, in common with other private institutions, they raised tuition rates as their costs increased. Very large tuition reduction supplements enable these institutions to reduce tuition and fees without loss of income and thus have added two large universities to those providing low-cost education to Pennsylvania residents. In effect, however, they have become state universities.

B. Operational Support for Specified Programs

Several states have appropriated funds to support private medical schools; e.g., Florida for the medical school at the University of Miami, Ohio for the Case Western Reserve Medical School, North Carolina for Duke and Bowman Gray, and Wisconsin for the Marquette Medical School which, to become eligible, severed its connection with Marquette University. Alabama contracts with the Tuskegee Institute for the education of Alabama residents studying engineering, veterinary medicine, and agriculture.

Tennessee private colleges and universities contribute trained manpower to the state in many occupational categories. Teachers constitute the largest professional group. Many of the college presidents make special mention of this contribution. One president notes that 44 per cent of the 1969 graduates of his college were eligible for Tennessee teacher's certificates. Another points out that 46 per cent of the teachers in his city system and 37 per cent of the teachers in his county system are graduates of his college, including 6 of 10 elementary school principals. Another cites concentrations of graduates of his college in the school systems of 2 counties. Peabody graduates are in teaching and administrative positions throughout the state, as are graduates of the other colleges.

The most frequent recommendation of the presidents of the private colleges and universities is that the state should establish a general scholarship program for Tennessee residents. The next most frequent recommendation is that the state contract with the private colleges for the education of special occupational groups. Teaching is the most frequently mentioned, but library science is also mentioned, and medicine, nursing, and other health professions are fields for consideration.

Another contribution of the private colleges is to higher education. They educate future faculty members for themselves and for the public colleges. Five of the colleges, chosen at random from a shelf of catalogues, have faculty members who hold at least one degree from a private Tennessee college in the following percentages: 23 per cent, 40 per cent, 41 per cent, and 43 per cent. A mere glance at other catalogues shows the phenomenon to be general. Many faculty members hold two degrees from Tennessee private institutions. Although the University of Tennessee leads all the rest, the number who hold advanced degrees from Peabody and Vanderbilt is striking.

Partly these concentrations of graduates of Tennessee colleges in their own faculties represent what is called "inbreeding"; and this, some think, is undesirable, although it assures dedicated faculty members with an institutional commitment. Most of the colleges do have considerable numbers of their own graduates on their faculties. But "inbreeding" is by no means the whole of it. For example, one college with a faculty of about 130 includes 30 of its own alumni, but it also includes 8 professors who hold undergraduate degrees and 16 who hold graduate degrees from other Tennessee private institutions. Another with a faculty of about 70 has 8 with undergraduate degrees and 11 with graduate degrees from other Tennessee private schools.

The private institutions of Tennessee have contributed faculty to

the public institutions as well as to the private ones. The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, has in its faculty of arts and sciences 110 faculty members who hold at least one degree from a private college or university in Tennessee; the University of Tennessee medical units have 63 faculty members with at least one degree from a Tennessee private institution; the University of Tennessee at Martin has 35; the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga has 29.

Faculty will be needed for the rapidly growing community colleges. Graduate programs specially designed for them might well be developed, perhaps jointly by Peabody, Fisk, and Vanderbilt, with state assistance.

C. General Maintenance Appropriations

Pennsylvania, in addition to "tuition reduction supplements" to "state-related" private institutions and in addition to basic support for a number of specified programs, makes general maintenance grants to a "state-assisted" university: the University of Pennsylvania. The sums are substantial. In 1969 tuition reduction supplements totalled $32,500,000. The "state-related" institutions (Temple, Pittsburgh, and Pennsylvania State University) also received general maintenance appropriations totalling $81,135,000. The University of Pennsylvania, "state-assisted," received $8,184,000, but the governor of Pennsylvania has proposed a sharp cut for next year.

Recent legislation in New York State provides for grants to eligible private institutions of $400 for each bachelor's or master's degree awarded and $2,400 for each earned doctorate awarded. The New York grants do not require that the graduates be residents of the state. They are notable also for the fact that they are awarded not on the basis of the number of students enrolled but on the basis of the number of degrees earned. The program began in 1968-69 and cost the state about $24 million. It is expected to cost about $26 million this year. Litigation is in progress to determine the eligibility of church-connected schools. Studies which have been completed or are in progress in other states and legislation pending in some of them indicate that state aid to private schools is a growing movement.

In short, there are plenty of precedents and plenty of models if the people of Tennessee wish to help needy students attend the colleges of their choice and at the same time buttress the strength of their private colleges. The trend in other states seems to be toward the provision of

grants or scholarships amounting to not more than the tuition and fees charged by the institution attended. Such a program, if established in Tennessee, would benefit the youth of the state, would benefit the state, and would benefit the colleges, but the primary benefit would be to the students. If maintaining the strength of the private colleges and universities is also regarded as of primary importance, there are more direct ways of achieving this end. Some have been indicated.

II. WHAT OTHER STUDIES RECOMMEND

There have been excellent studies in other states. Some of them begin with the premise that something should be done to assist the private colleges; others arrive at the conclusion that something should be done. The charge to the New York State Committee, whose report published in 1968 has already resulted in action, asks for advice to the Governor and the Board of Regents on "how the state can help preserve the strength and vitality of our private and independent institutions of higher education, yet at the same time keep them free." In Illinois, the legislature sought advice on the proper relationship of public and private institutions and on "constitutional means by which the state can aid the nonpublic institutions in fulfillment of their task."

The Missouri Commission on Higher Education asked for a report on "means of making private institutions, in fact, more an integral part of Missouri higher education." In California the request for a study came from the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and asked among other things for consideration of "new sources of external financing, both governmental and nongovernmental." In Oregon the Educational Coordinating Council asked "how the State can help preserve the strength and vitality of its private and independent institutions of higher education and at the same time preserve their independence," and also for "appropriate ways and means." In Massachusetts the Governor asked a Select Committee "to conduct an examination of the present financial status and problems facing the private degree-granting institutions of the state . . . , to make projections of future income and expenditures . . . , and to conduct an exploration of possible alternatives in meeting the needs." In Tennessee the Tennessee Council of Private Colleges and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission asked for "a survey . . . to appraise the contribution of the private sector to higher education in the state." Concern for the

private institutions is national and the Federation of State Associations of Independent Colleges and Universities is addressing itself to the problem nationally.

All of the reports recognize that the costs of higher education in private colleges and universities are rising faster than their incomes and that new sources of income must be found if the quality of private higher education is not to be impaired. This is hardly surprising. As the Massachusetts study points out, the public press has emphasized the financial plight of private colleges for some years; it refers to stories on "The Precarious Future of the Private Colleges," on "The Coming Crisis in Private Colleges," and on the "Question of Survival" of private colleges in magazines such as *Time, U. S. News and World Report,* and *Fortune.* It could have added a number of professional journals and it might have cited almost any metropolitan newspaper. Further evidence of the reality of the crisis is the fact that, in recent years, such large and well-established institutions as Rutgers University, Temple University, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Buffalo, the University of Houston, and the University of Chattanooga have moved from the private to the public sector.

It is no catastrophe to become a public institution, but when a private institution is weakened, or closes, or shifts to state control, the contribution made by the private sector is lessened and the imbalance between private and public sectors is increased. It may in some ways weaken the entire structure of higher education. Also, it can be very expensive to the state. In addition to the $32,500,000 "tuition reduction supplements" paid by the state of Pennsylvania to Pittsburgh and Temple, Pennsylvania in 1968-69 made appropriations totalling $29,789,000 for the general operational support of those two "state-related" institutions. Although the New York study affirms that "the State of New York and society as a whole have benefited" from the shift of the University of Buffalo from private to public status, it also points out that it cost the state $122 million to operate the university from 1961 through 1967, whereas it would have cost only $58 million in subsidies "to provide sufficient funds to enable it to progress rapidly toward first-class university status, as has in fact been the effect of the take-over." The state appropriation for the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga in 1969-70 was $3,052,000.

It should be observed that the costs of public higher education are subject to the same inflation that private colleges are experiencing and

that the states will have to find new money for public education in large amounts. Many of the state studies argue that if states fail in their long-range planning to regard the private institutions as important in the multiple system of higher education, the amount of support required by the public sector will be the greater. They state a paradox: ***If the states do not support their private colleges, it will be more difficult for them to give their public institutions the support they should have.***

The recommendations of the several state studies are less uniform than their descriptions of the problems of private colleges, but recent legislation in several states and proposed legislation in others reflect the conclusions of the studies and suggest that one or two patterns are emerging.

The recent New York state legislation providing for grants to colleges and universities for each degree granted resulted from a recommendation of the New York study. Other recommendations of the New York report are summarized by McFarlane as follows:

> Specific recommendations call for a strengthening of the office of the Associate Commissioner for Higher Education to allow overview of both private and public sectors, adoption of improved enrollment prediction methods for all of higher education by the Board of Regents, consideration of contractual graduate education arrangements with private institutions, statewide cooperative development of public and private library reference and research resources, provision of planning grant funds for stimulating public and private interinstitutional cooperation, and establishment of a Commission on Independent Colleges as a spokesman for the private institutions.

The Massachusetts study also recommends direct financial support to private institutions but proposes that the grants be based on the number of degrees awarded to Massachusetts residents, not, as in New York, on the total number of degrees. It also recommends that awards be based on a percentage of the cost to the state of a comparable degree from a comparable public institution—approximately 15 per cent. Argument supporting these recommendations follows:

> By serving a substantial number of Massachusetts residents, the private colleges and universities relieve the Commonwealth of the responsibility of educating those residents solely at public expense. By giving private colleges and universities financial support equaling a small fraction of the cost of educating stu-

dents in the public institutions, the Commonwealth would help maintain the private sector's ability to educate Massachusetts residents at present or increased levels of enrollment and quality. At this time, we propose that the funding level be set at 15 per cent of the actual public cost of educating a Massachusetts resident in a comparable public institution.

The proposal provides for deductions for prior state payments in two situations: when an associate degree has been earned en route to a bachelor's degree and when a master's degree has been earned en route to a doctorate. It also asks, of course, for a more accurate estimate of costs of degrees in the public institutions if the program is adopted. The proposed award per degree is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

PROPOSED AWARD PER DEGREE FOR MASSACHUSETTS RESIDENTS IN 1972-1973

Degree Type	*Estimated 1972-73 Public Cost per Degree*	*Proposed Award (Approximately 15 Per Cent of Public Costs)*
Associate	$ 2,800	$ 400
Bachelor's	7,000	1,000
Master's	5,300	800
First Professional	7,900	1,200
Ph.D.	21,000	3,100
Medical and Dental	28,000	4,200

The Oregon report recommends that the state "contract" with two- and four-year private colleges for the education of Oregon residents they enroll and that payment be made at a rate of $80 for every 45 quarter hours or equivalent completed. It also recommends a student financial aid program based on "the difference between the family's financial ability and the student's educational budget at the institution of his choice."

The Maryland *Master Plan* in its first phase deals primarily with problems and plans for the public sector, but it also outlines various means of assisting private institutions—greatly increased student aid, direct subsidies for maintenance costs, grants on the basis of students enrolled or degrees granted, and partial support of specialized programs.

It recommends that the Maryland Council for Higher Education, working with a citizens committee, study both the extent of the financial problems of the private colleges and ways of insuring their continued existence—ways that are in the best interests of both the state and the institutions.

The Vermont study includes the unique recommendation that serious consideration be given to the need and desirability as well as feasibility of including independent post-secondary institutions as part of a statewide, comprehensive system of continuing education, and that it not limit its consideration only to degree-granting courses or programs, but that arrangements be explored which will be beneficial for a broad range of Vermont citizens in terms of age, interests, and previous educational preparation. The study suggests two methods of financing: (1) direct grants when additional facilities or equipment are required, and (2) contractual arrangements to reimburse institutions for the cost of an educational service. The representative of one of the urban Tennessee colleges specifically mentions an extensive program of adult education as a noteworthy service to its community.

Only the California study stresses the dangers to the "independence" of private institutions inherent in the acceptance of public funds:

> If substantially increased Federal or state funds are given to independent institutions of higher learning, we question whether these funds will come as free of restrictions and accountability as traditional sources of support. . . . While broader government support for higher education, including the private sector, will undoubtedly become a reality, for truly independent institutions it may not be a perfect solution.

But the report also says:

> It seems almost certain that, barring significant breakthroughs in private giving and resource management, many institutions will not be able to match constantly rising expenditures with traditional sources of income, and that additional resources will have to be sought to finance projected deficits. It is highly likely that many institutions, if they are to continue as separate entities, will need assistance from nonprivate sources through additional types of Federal government support or financial aid programs from the State of California.

It has been pointed out that an amendment to the California constitu-

tion designed to permit direct appropriations to private colleges and universities has passed the California assembly.

Pfnister and Quehl, in their study for the state of Missouri, are less explicit in their recommendations than are authors of some other studies. They endorse an already proposed program of student aid and recommend that all institutions be regarded as available resources in statewide planning. They suggest that the feasibility of using private facilities to supplement those of the state through purchase of services or exchange of students be considered, and that the feasibility of state grants to regional organizations of colleges be given careful consideration. They recommend that consideration be given to the establishment of a fact-finding and consulting service open to private as well as public institutions, and that a general study of graduate education in the state be undertaken. They also make the provocative recommendation that "the private higher educational institutions engage in a more systematic analysis of their own uniqueness."

Although the General Assembly of Illinois, for example, asked for advice on "constitutional means by which the State can aid the nonpublic institutions in the fulfillment of their task," few of the studies refrain from making recommendations which involve constitutional change. Some simply say: if aid to private colleges is unconstitutional, change the constitution.

The studies that have been abstracted here are representative. Others are in progress or about to be initiated. *Private Higher Education in North Carolina,* published in 1969 by the North Carolina Board of Higher Education, concludes as follows:

> The North Carolina Board of Higher Education agrees that the maintenance of strong dual systems of private and public higher education is in the state's best interest. In addition to other reasons for the preservation of a dual system, we recognize that to the extent that private institutions educate citizens of the state, the state itself is saved expense. Today the saving is over $800 per student each year for operating costs alone.
>
> The Board of Higher Education recommends . . . that consideration be given to providing state assistance to private higher education in North Carolina. To this end the Board of Higher Education, with the cooperation and assistance of the private institutions of higher education, will undertake a study of how best to implement such a program and will submit rec-

ommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly for consideration during the 1971 Legislative Session. This study will be coordinated with the study of the need to establish the statewide student assistance program which is recommended.

6 Choices for Tennessee

In this study it is assumed and argued that pluralism—variety of control, public and private; variety of purpose; and variety of program—is a strength of American higher education. Because it is a study of private higher education, it makes a special case for the private sector. It describes present and predicts greater future financial difficulties of private colleges and universities if new sources of revenue are not found. It describes potential sources of income and implies that, without state funds, few private colleges and universities can improve, some will deteriorate, and some may not survive. Descriptions of programs and proposals in other states, supplemented by suggestions from representatives of the Tennessee colleges and members of the Advisory Committee and staff of the study, present a variety of ways in which Tennessee might choose to support its private colleges and universities. Most of the generalizations of the study apply to private higher education the country over. Here they are applied to Tennessee.

Support for private higher education, in Tennessee or elsewhere, should not be at the expense of public education. If the people of Tennessee authorize allocation of public funds to private colleges, it will not enable them to spend less on public higher education. Public colleges will continue to grow and multiply and costs per student will continue to rise. The public sector must be more generously supported. So must the private sector. Long-range planning for higher education is essential, and it should take cognizance not only of the state's needs but also of all its existing educational resources, both public and private. Representatives of the public, the state colleges and universities, and the private colleges and universities should participate in such planning.

For this reason, the Advisory Committee and the staff of the Joint

Study recommend no specific measures for the support of private higher education in Tennessee. Whatever is done should be in the interest of the people of Tennessee and of both the public and private colleges and universities. Therefore, only two recommendations are made:

1. **The people of Tennessee, giving full consideration to the contributions and needs of both public and private colleges and universities, should increase their support to public higher education and, in addition, should give consideration to the early establishment of programs for the support of private higher education.**

2. **The Tennessee Higher Education Commission, in its long-range planning for higher education in Tennessee, should arrange for continuing participation of representatives of private higher education in Tennessee.** There should be continuing examination of the costs, the benefits to the state, and the consequences to both public and private colleges of various ways of supporting private colleges, leading to specific recommendations to the governor, the legislature, and the people of Tennessee for the support of private colleges.

Among the issues which should be considered are those raised by the presidents of the colleges taking part in this study. The presidents were asked to suggest ways in which the state of Tennessee might appropriately support the private colleges. Their awareness of the general need and their knowledge of what is transpiring throughout the country were such that their letters provided the basic plan and anticipated the substance of this report at the beginning of the study. They and members of the Advisory Committee in their various responses and in conference suggested almost every kind of program that has been adopted or proposed in other states.

The presidents taking part in the study suggest expansion of the guaranteed loan program. They recommend establishment of a state program of general assistance to Tennessee students. They suggest programs of assistance to students preparing for specific occupations. They favor contracts for educational, cultural, and research services; often they specify particular programs—education of teachers, librarians, practitioners of the health professions, adults in programs of continuing education, and disadvantaged students. Some are ready to perform, under contract, community college functions for their regions. They would welcome educational facilities grants.

The presidents recommend direct grants to colleges based on the number of students enrolled, the number of Tennessee students en-

rolled, or the number of credits earned or degrees conferred. They suggest support for programs to foster faculty self-improvement. They propose to strengthen the Tennessee Council of Private Colleges and to continue close liaison with the Higher Education Commission. They hope to establish better communication with the public colleges and universities. They recommend state provision of, or support for, central fact-finding and consulting services.

The presidents are ready to take part in collaborative educational programs, among themselves or with public institutions. They suggest that there might be advantages in other collaborative efforts: group purchasing, joint appointments, faculty and student exchanges, common health services, and the like. They ask that the private institutions, as an important educational asset to the state, have a voice in future planning for Tennessee higher education.

No one president or committee member has suggested all of these measures, nor does anyone think the state might engage in all of them. These are the major suggestions in response to a question which asked: "What should the state of Tennessee be asked to do that would benefit your college and other private colleges?" The question might well have added, "and that would benefit Tennessee higher education generally."

The colleges themselves, of course, should take what steps they can to effect economies and increase their revenues. As gifts become harder to get, fund-raising efforts must become even more vigorous. Endowment management can be improved. Cooperative efforts—joint programs, joint appointments, student and faculty exchanges among neighboring institutions—may result in savings. A strengthened Tennessee Council of Private Colleges and a centralized research and consulting agency may help both in fund-raising and in better management and planning. With bankers on their boards, the colleges can urge expansion of the guaranteed loan program.

What the colleges can do themselves, however, is not enough. This report is concluded by listing options which might be considered by the state of Tennessee, based on what other states are doing and on what has been proposed in other states.

1. To support students, the state might:
    a. Establish a general program of scholarships and grants based on student need and the costs at the college of his choice.
    b. Establish categorical programs of scholarships or loans; that

is, provide support for students preparing for occupations in short supply.

c. Establish programs of service scholarships or loans, requiring assurance that the student will remain in the state to pursue his occupation for a specified period.

2. To support and strengthen the colleges, the state might:

   a. Make grants to the colleges based on the number of students enrolled, the number of Tennessee students enrolled, the number of credits earned, or the number and degrees conferred.
   b. Contract with private institutions for education in specified fields (e.g., teacher education) or for special groups (e.g., disadvantaged youth).
   c. Make grants for general maintenance.
   d. Make grants for building educational facilities for expanded present programs or for new programs important to the state.
   e. Make grants or contracts for interinstitutional programs—among private institutions or between private and public colleges.

3. To improve management and planning, the state might:

   a. Establish or support a central fact-finding and consulting service, perhaps through the Tennessee Higher Education Commission or the Tennessee College Association Center for Higher Education.
   b. Arrange for greater involvement of the Tennessee Council of Private Colleges in statewide planning for higher education, for which this study provides a precedent.

The people of Tennessee have at least one other option. They can choose to do nothing they are not now doing for the independent colleges and universities. If they choose this option, it is believed that few of the private institutions can be strengthened, that some will deteriorate, and that others may fail. The percentage of students served by the private colleges will continue to decline. It seems inevitable that, if the quality of educational opportunity is not to be sacrificed, expansion of public colleges and universities will be required with proportionate costs.

It is difficult to believe that the people of Tennessee will choose this option. Rather, it is believed they will find means to assure the continued health of their private colleges and universities and at the same time increase their support of a growing system of public higher education.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Private Colleges of Tennessee

Name	*Location*	*President*
Aquinas Junior College	Nashville	Sister Henry Suso Fletcher, O.P.
Belmont College	Nashville	Herbert C. Gabhart
Bethel College	McKenzie	James E. McKee
Bryan College (Wm. Jennings)	Dayton	Theodore C. Mercer
Carson-Newman College	Jefferson City	John A. Fincher
Christian Brothers College	Memphis	Bro. Malcolm O'Sullivan
Cumberland College	Lebanon	Ernest L. Stockton
David Lipscomb College	Nashville	Athens C. Pullias
Fisk University	Nashville	James R. Lawson
Freed-Hardeman College	Henderson	E. Claude Gardner
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	Nashville	L. C. Johnson
Geo. Peabody Col. for Teachers	Nashville	John M. Claunch
Hiwassee College	Madisonville	Horace N. Barker
Johnson Bible College	Knoxville	David L. Eubanks
King College	Bristol	Powell A. Fraser
Knoxville College	Knoxville	Robert L. Owens, III
Lambuth College	Jackson	James S. Wilder, Jr.
Lane College	Jackson	Herman Stone, Jr.
Lee College	Cleveland	James A. Cross
LeMoyne-Owen College	Memphis	Odell Horton
Lincoln Memorial University	Harrogate	H. Y. Livesay
Martin College	Pulaski	Harry D. Wagner
Maryville College	Maryville	J. J. Copeland
Meharry Medical College	Nashville	Lloyd C. Elam
Memphis Academy of Arts, The	Memphis	Edwin C. Rust (Dir.)
Milligan College	Milligan College	Jess W. Johnson
Morristown College	Morristown	J. Otis Erwin
Scarritt College	Nashville	Gerald H. Anderson
Siena College	Memphis	Sister Marina Gibbons
South, University of the	Sewanee	Edward McCrady (V-Chan.)
Southern College of Optometry	Memphis	Spurgeon B. Eure
Southern Missionary College	Collegedale	Wilbert M. Schneider
Southwestern at Memphis	Memphis	William L. Bowden
Tennessee Temple College	Chattanooga	Lee Roberson
Tenn. Wesleyan College	Athens	Charles C. Turner, Jr.
Tomlinson College	Cleveland	J. D. Wilkinson, Jr.
Trevecca Nazarene College	Nashville	Mark R. Moore
Tusculum College	Greeneville	Andrew N. Cothran
Union University	Jackson	Robert Craig
Vanderbilt University	Nashville	Alexander Heard (Chan.)

APPENDIX B

Total Enrollment Figures

Inst. Code	*1964*	*1965*	*1966*	*1967*	*1968*	*1969*	*1970*	*1975*	*1980*
Two-Year Institutions									
4	251	265	331	280	172	155	NA	NA	NA
8	637	734	769	702	718	758	785	932	1,107
16	–	–	–	72	100	145	160	300	400
20	NA	NA	689	620	620	629	630	869	900
27	72	103	137	97	203	234	300	350	400
41	385	484	512	456	410	345	350	NA	NA
42	261	302	350	366	397	404	425	500	500
SUBTOTAL	1,606	1,888	2,788	2,593	2,620	2,670	2,650	2,951	3,307
Four-Year Institutions									
5	270	281	300	339	340	328	350	510	700
6	–	–	–	–	695	703	725	850	900
6A	645	641	677	641	–	–	–	–	–
9	820	812	882	828	757	714	775	975	1,200
10	843	907	955	953	889	914	1,400	1,650	1,900
12	584	789	815	808	808	685	725	850	1,000
13	824	1,049	1,082	992	992	986	1,000	1,200	1,400
17	578	653	768	959	929	1,042	1,165	1,270	1,325
18	2,024	2,169	1,704	1,798	1,824	1,764	1,650	1,700	1,800
19	NA	NA	961	1,034	1,102	976	1,225	1,800	2,300
21	349	410	365	465	498	486	175	180	200
22	272	292	361	395	408	418	NA	NA	NA
25	706	896	1,082	1,113	1,127	1,006	1,100	1,300	1,500

TOTAL ENROLLMENT FIGURES (continued)

Inst. Code	*1964*	*1965*	*1966*	*1967*	*1968*	*1969*	*1970*	*1975*	*1980*
26	576	718	879	853	808	752	700	850	900
28	680	847	862	863	833	773	800	1,000	1,500
29	158	179	176	230	233	226	250	275	300
34	557	573	581	658	777	741	800	1,000	1,500
35	970	1,125	1,146	1,202	1,370	1,309	1,350	1,508	1,650
38	305	370	310	303	318	307	330	500	600
40	827	950	1,051	1,106	1,161	1,113	1,150	1,300	1,500
43	262	303	288	323	355	318	368	600	800
44	301	372	383	401	–	–	–	–	–
47	501	494	561	602	611	581	650	800	1,000
48	627	819	839	864	837	863	855	1,000	1,200
52	1,550	1,827	1,884	2,053	2,142	2,205	2,250	2,350	2,500
54	813	906	935	809	753	788	850	1,150	1,400
55	940	992	1,019	1,031	994	1,057	1,050	1,200	1,275
56	563	700	684	746	800	666	750	1,400	1,500
SUBTOTAL	17,545	20,074	21,550	22,369	22,361	21,721	22,443	27,218	30,650
Graduate Institutions									
1	1,949	2,100	1,819	1,793	1,806	1,886	1,900	2,050	2,200
3	168	182	153	172	207	206	190	200	240
32	4,616	4,917	5,334	5,561	5,797	5,963	6,270	7,668	8,541
36	970	1,025	1,135	1,190	1,161	1,240	1,295	2,150	2,700
49	788	820	902	917	862	965	970	1,065	1,065
SUBTOTAL	8,491	9,044	9,343	9,633	9,833	10,260	10,625	13,133	14,746
TOTAL	27,642	31,006	33,681	34,595	34,814	34,651	35,718	43,302	48,703

APPENDIX C

Assets and Projected Capital Outlays

	Assets			*Projected Capital Outlay 1969-79 Decade*		
Inst. Code	*Book Value*	*Replacement Cost*	*Other*	*Academic Buildings*	*Dormitories and Apartments*	*Auxiliary Space*
Two-Year Institutions						
8	$ 3,052,364	$ 5,315,000		$ 1,750,000	$ 2,250,000	$ 1,000,000
16	643,840	871,150		600,000		200,000
20	4,181,363	5,009,000	$ 251,891		750,000	300,000
27	446,556		448,578	450,000		
41	1,745,691	2,000,000	340,000	300,000	300,000	100,000
42	2,788,533		249,463	2,000,000	700,000	150,000
SUBTOTAL	$ 12,858,347	$ 13,195,150	$ 1,289,932	$ 5,100,000	$ 4,000,000	$ 1,750,000
Four-Year Institutions						
5	$ 2,404,352	$ 5,000,000	$ 249,964	$ 1,500,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 600,000
6	1,922,121		459,353	1,500,000		
9	9,375,005	9,817,400	427,504	4,000,000	800,000	250,000
10	6,845,967		1,429,426	4,500,000		3,500,000
12	3,153,038		80,838		1,000,000	30,000
13	5,727,005					
17	4,320,072			1,500,000	2,500,000	1,500,000
18	10,672,400		1,747,631	2,500,000		1,000,000
19	2,375,629	4,000,000		6,201,200	9,880,000	2,198,000
21	1,423,000					
25	2,939,134	4,114,788		1,500,500	700,000	750,000
26	4,687,616	5,989,000	680,554	1,100,000	2,000,000	175,000

Assets and Projected Capital Outlays (continued)

	Assets			Projected Capital Outlay 1969-79 Decade		
Inst. Code	*Book Value*	*Replacement Cost*	*Other*	*Academic Buildings*	*Dormitories and Apartments*	*Auxiliary Space*
28	$ 9,358,923		$ 1,020,710	$ 1,500,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 75,000
29	1,240,083		60,821	2,000,000	1,000,000	100,000
34	4,233,295		428,724	2,000,000	750,000	250,000
35	7,335,039					
38	1,282,195	$ 1,218,085				
40	4,847,279		120,918	500,000	750,000	1,100,000
43	3,881,378	5,700,000		4,500,000	3,000,000	1,000,000
47	2,677,739	5,459,854	446,607	2,000,000	3,873,000	917,670
48	6,459,605	10,000,000		2,780,000	3,140,000	620,000
52	14,875,302	25,000,000	521,932	5,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000
54	3,544,234	5,000,000		6,700,000	2,500,000	
55	11,069,551			1,500,000		1,500,000
56	4,685,149	NA	610,462	750,000	2,500,000	750,000
SUBTOTAL	$ 131,335,111	$ 81,299,127	$ 8,285,444	$ 53,531,700	$38,393,000	$17,315,670
Graduate Institutions						
1	$ 14,997,866	$ 25,000,000	$ 3,193,326		$ 2,000,000	
3	4,054,036	5,231,880	803,563			$ 600,000
32	71,288,579	NA	29,791,168	$ 51,955,000	13,800,000	30,183,000
36	9,978,818		1,619,232	11,325,000	6,450,000	2,300,000
49	18,723,883	20,700,000	2,154,329	806,000	507,601	750,000
SUBTOTAL	$ 119,043,182	$ 50,931,880	$37,561,618	$ 64,086,000	$22,757,601	$33,833,000
GRAND TOTAL	$ 263,236,640	$145,426,157	$47,136,994	$122,717,700	$65,150,601	$52,898,670

APPENDIX D

INCOME BY SOURCE

	Tuition and Fees			*Federal Government*		
Inst. Code	*Charges for Educational Operations*	*Charges for Auxiliary Enterprises*	*Charges Earmarked for Capital Outlay*	*Research and Instructional Program*	*Student Aid*	*Other Gifts, Grants & Contracts*
Two-Year Institutions						
8	$ 566,727			$ 13,785	$ 117,691	$ 285,930
16	52,693					45,115
20	372,483	$ 19,442		8,000	78,009	91,953
27	151,567				5,000	1,074
41	184,863	3,710	$ 64,000	14,200	38,000	64,687
42	265,736				22,459	102,778
SUBTOTAL	$ 1,594,069	$ 23,152	$ 64,000	$ 35,985	$ 261,159	$ 591,537
Four-Year Institutions						
5	$ 269,417					$ 146,506
6	490,444			$ 120,812	$ 58,550	436,191
9	789,873			138,085	51,053	395,802
10	562,107			488,298	313,887	1,727,767
12	691,119	$ 7,808	$ 12,013		79,298	74,046
13	823,693	4,161				272,648
17	533,568					39,497
18	1,688,630			34,936	56,645	378,883
19	902,291	34,228		345,750	488,434	329,962
21	153,010				5,000	3,500
25	760,675				340,255	416,230
26	660,012			16,231	46,831	220,359
28	955,045	52,740			66,857	282,588

INCOME BY SOURCE (continued)

	Tuition and Fees			Federal Government		
Inst. Code	*Charges for Educational Operations*	*Charges for Auxiliary Enterprises*	*Charges Earmarked for Capital Outlay*	*Research and Instructional Program*	*Student Aid*	*Other Gifts, Grants & Contracts*
29	$ 57,022	$ 15,000				$ 208,330
34	615,710				$ 91,053	
35	1,492,112					210,178
38	162,101			$ 29,786	21,203	20,927
40	1,045,525			284,375	56,717	103,450
43	405,354	7,065		85,282	58,556	181,422
47	613,913	21,321		37,420	11,280	112,454
48	614,388	62,373				193,229
52	82,641,931	12,558			127,037	202,017
54	676,473					373,222
55	1,555,215			86,498	113,742	1,302,499
56	559,355				76,865	136,061
SUBTOTAL	$18,718,983	$217,254	$ 12,013	$ 1,667,473	$2,063,263	$ 7,767,768
Graduate Institutions						
1	$ 2,428,845	$ 27,054	$ 38,862	$ 2,717,446	$ 175,086	$ 499,858
3	152,575	1,615			1,865	290,137
32	9,496,257			11,265,796	2,261,454	5,983,885
36	1,204,975			541,991		1,023,204
49	1,510,875	25,947		97,041	35,924	454,641
SUBTOTAL	$14,793,527	$ 54,616	$ 38,862	$14,622,274	$2,474,329	$ 8,251,725
TOTAL	$35,106,579	$295,022	$114,875	$16,325,732	$4,798,751	$16,611,030

APPENDIX E

STUDENT AID

Inst. Code	Scholarships & Fellowships: From Institutional Funds	Scholarships & Fellowships: From Outside Sources	Work Study: From Institutional Funds	Work Study: From Outside Sources	Income	Expenditures	Deficit or Surplus
Two-Year Institutions							
8	$ 87,063	$ 99,566			$ 1,649,792	$ 1,585,944	$ 63,848
16	2,500				156,212	133,622	22,590
20	28,004	50,055	$ 5,962	$ 33,787	1,191,383	1,237,997	(46,614)
27	3,250	6,074	4,347		174,430	173,823	607
41	8,545	38,000			584,843	528,187	56,656
42	24,024	3,841	1,597	6,387	615,607	594,239	21,368
SUBTOTAL	$ 153,386	$ 197,536	$ 11,906	$ 40,174	$ 4,372,267	$ 4,253,812	$ 118,455
Four-Year Institutions							
5	$ 19,150	$ 5,030	$ 6,351		$ 756,901	$ 887,283	$ (130,382)
6	53,466	7,025	14,659		1,258,050	1,271,339	(13,289)
9	80,445	21,410	1,875	$ 23,433	2,272,857	2,437,066	(164,209)
10	140,113	256,391	36,307	109,471	3,159,059	3,419,052	(259,992)
12	79,305	8,450	7,008	37,372	1,351,423	1,295,889	55,534
13	34,815				1,380,479	1,365,995	14,484
17	40,886				1,258,515	1,448,658	(109,142)
18	75,620	56,645			3,566,808	3,323,719	243,089
19	34,000		112,597	381,782	2,662,694	2,467,648	195,046
21					273,010	272,700	310
25	50,209	340,255	11,579		1,995,977	2,067,576	71,599
26	64,542	30,708	28,909	16,123	1,470,374	1,617,217	(146,843)

74

STUDENT AID (continued)

Inst. Code	Scholarships & Fellowships: From Institutional Funds	Scholarships & Fellowships: From Outside Sources	Work Study: From Institutional Funds	Work Study: From Outside Sources	Income	Expenditures	Deficit or Surplus
28	$ 97,039	$ 46,839	$ 3,077	$ 12,307	$ 2,049,527	$ 2,038,667	$ 10,860
29	60,000				484,220	320,354	163,867
34	62,801	28,500	52,859	50,510	1,589,027	1,552,103	36,924
35	53,536				2,965,232	2,730,456	234,777
38	2,800	31,300	2,116	8,063	364,621	310,481	54,140
40	24,105	32,612	7,041	30,051	2,037,960	2,131,565	(93,605)
43	111,355	41,708			1,096,480	1,110,945	14,465
47	47,532		24,879	20,703	1,386,036	1,555,214	(187,178)
48	24,505				1,499,832	1,455,297	44,535
52	190,680	130,390	182,432	53,886	4,604,880	4,599,245	5,635
54	71,949	6,300			1,480,210	1,448,800	31,410
55	186,372	190,202	8,299		4,054,482	4,394,384	(339,902)
56	47,037				1,213,894	1,247,950	(34,054)
SUBTOTAL	$1,604,700	$1,233,765	$499,988	$743,701	$ 46,232,548	$ 46,769,603	$ (537,055)
Graduate Institutions							
1	$ 181,679	$ 84,950	$ 15,546	$ 90,136	$ 8,267,853	$ 8,651,321	$ (383,468)
3	55,627	12,600	13,363	1,866	696,264	786,932	(90,668)
32	1,377,309	3,104,965	8,129	32,444	54,558,315	54,251,326	306,989
36	114,292	96,313	67,422		4,257,017	5,150,468	(893,451)
49	124,342	26,950	2,269	8,974	6,255,908	6,844,431	(588,523)
SUBTOTAL	$1,853,249	$3,325,778	$106,729	$133,420	$ 74,035,357	$ 75,684,478	$(1,649,121)
GRAND TOTAL	$3,611,335	$4,757,079	$618,623	$917,295	$124,640,172	$126,707,893	$(2,067,721)

APPENDIX F

Number of Students Receiving Aid

Inst. Code	Scholarships and Fellowships		Loans		Jobs on Campus		Jobs off Campus	
	In State	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*
Two-Year Institutions								
8	162	170	77	105	56	90	NA	NA
16	2	8	NA	NA	3	7	NA	NA
20	58	10	52	32	86	47	NA	NA
27	51	NA	NA	NA	24	1	NA	NA
41	32	8	60	26	28	10	40	NA
42	86	22	49	NA	45	6	NA	NA
SUBTOTAL	381	218	233	163	242	161	40	NA
Four-Year Institutions								
5	33	101	18	87	27	141	1	4
6	160	18	163	8	119	12	69	2
9	110	161	31	81	110	190	NA	NA
10	236	470	150	350	84	215	35	52
12	85	60	67	80	35	64	4	5
13	125	54	200	75	175	100	65	30
17	100*		337*		171*		494*	
18	148	110	198	144	120	127	20	9
19	19	7	111	123	426	327	12	1
21	8	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	14	9

* Only total number receiving aid. No break-down.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING AID (continued)

Inst. Code	Scholarships and Fellowships		Loans		Jobs on Campus		Jobs off Campus	
	In State	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*
25	13	79	116	225	63	262	18	25
26	141	24	103	28	70	32	NA	NA
28	107	55	136	70	154	80	NA	NA
29	15	110	1	5	20	105	NA	NA
34	63	78	96	119	52	66	8	11
35	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
38	6	7	15	19	23	6	NA	NA
40	34	25	65	46	53	60	31	25
43	NA	NA	NA	NA	39	72	NA	1
47	59	81	21	88	54	20	20	11
48	10	52	10	53	29	151	NA	NA
52	147	363	90	210	128	297	NA	NA
54	193	31	264	24	91	17	68	8
55	182	204	63	53	53	127	124	40
56	110*		317*		317*		150*	
SUBTOTAL	1,894	2,095	1,918	1,888	1,925	2,471	489	233
	210*		654*		488*		811*	

* Only total number receiving aid. No. break-down.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING AID (continued)

Inst. Code	Scholarships and Fellowships		Loans		Jobs on Campus		Jobs off Campus	
	In State	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*	*In State*	*Out State*
Graduate Institutions								
1	143	121	285	154	131	97	NA	NA
3	36	91	4	12	12	18	43	13
32	339	753	270	601	20	70	NA	NA
36	27	307	36	327	14	225	NA	NA
49	100	194	66	144	33	66	5	14
SUBTOTAL	645	1,466	661	1,238	210	476	48	27
GRAND TOTAL	2,920	3,779	2,812	3,289	2,377	3,108	577	260

APPENDIX G

AVERAGE COST TO STUDENT

Inst. Code	1960 Tuition	1960 General Fees	1960 Room & Board	1960 Total	1965 Tuition	1965 General Fees	1965 Room & Board	1965 Total	1968 Tuition	1968 General Fees	1968 Room & Board	1968 Total
Two-Year Institutions												
8	$ 384	$ 72	$ 413	$ 869	$ 576	NA	$ 508	$1,084	$ 736	NA	$ 660	$1,396
16	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	500	$ 30	325	855
20	390	0	390	780	504	0	519	1,023	600	0	570	1,170
27	–	–	–	–	350	$ 44	0	394	500	44	0	544
41	360	40	600	1,000	400	80	600	1,080	450	70	640	1,160
42	360	80	450	890	528	100	581	1,209	720	100	777	1,597
Four-Year Institutions												
5	0	$ 450	$ 558	$1,008	0	$ 600	$ 675	$1,275	0	$ 800	$ 856	$1,656
6	$ 355	25	0	380	$ 455	25	0	480	$ 520	55	0	575
9	480	20	520	1,020	700	60	600	1,360	900	70	780	1,750
10	327	0	471	798	476	0	600	1,076	641	0	700	1,341
12	300	75	520	895	450	105	580	1,135	825	120	685	1,630
13	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	800	58	688	1,546
17	250	10	540	800	350	10	585	945	530	10	711	1,251
18	470	2	420	892	650	2	470	1,122	800	2	740	1,542
19	300	53	329	682	400	113	490	1,003	600	117	560	1,277
21	350	25	0	375	550	25	0	575	670	25	0	1,750
25	340	54	432	826	500	NA	500	1,000	650	NA	650	1,300
26	510	0	525	1,035	675	0	650	1,325	780	0	735	1,515
28	300	70	475	845	500	100	590	1,190	1,000	150	680	1,830
29	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	450	150	640	1,240
34	471	0	426	897	570	0	426	996	930	0	765	1,695

Average Cost to Student (continued)

Inst. Code	1960 Tuition	1960 General Fees	1960 Room & Board	1960 Total	1965 Tuition	1965 General Fees	1965 Room & Board	1965 Total	1968 Tuition	1968 General Fees	1968 Room & Board	1968 Total
35	$ 608	$ 50	$ 504	$1,162	$ 870	$ 50	$ 605	$1,525	$1,170	$ 75	$ 745	$1,990
38	350	30	700	1,080	450	30	800	1,280	700	40	1,100	1,840
40	500	40	720	1,260	725	51	730	1,506	888	64	875	1,827
47	440	0	470	910	648	0	595	1,243	1,025	0	800	1,825
48	360	60	470	890	525	60	630	1,215	605	62	775	1,442
52	480	0	450	930	720	0	579	1,299	1,056	0	825	1,881
54	350	80	390	820	520	135	590	1,245	576	220	720	1,516
55	650	100	645	1,395	1,000	100	695	1,795	1,200	100	850	2,150
56	270	45	100*	415	640	45	225*	685	720	70	750	1,540
Graduate Institutions												
1	$ 450	$ 2	$ 150*	$ 602	$ 675	$ 10	$ 270*	$ 955	$1,200	$ 25	$ 637	$1,862
3	600	92	600	1,292	600	93	765	1,458	800	93	850	1,743
36	465	23	499	987	750	26	615	1,391	1,000	43	815	1,858
49	900	160	640	1,700	1,350	220	750	2,320	1,650	250	810	2,710
52	750	180	760	1,690	1,200	225	850	2,275	1,660	270	1,040	2,970
Graduate Tuition												
1	$ 576				$ 960				$1,125			
3	No difference between undergraduate and graduate tuition											
36	No difference between undergraduate and graduate tuition											
49	500				700				825			
52	630				1,000				1,460			

NA No Answer
* Board not included

Average Cost to Student (continued)

Inst. Code	1970 Tuition	1970 General Fees	1970 Room & Board	1970 Total	1975 Tuition	1975 General Fees	1975 Room & Board	1975 Total	1980 Tuition	1980 General Fees	1980 Room & Board	1980 Total
Two-Year Institutions												
8	$ 864	NA	$ 700	$1,564	$1,152	NA	$ 910	$2,062	$1,440	NA	$1,180	$2,620
16	720	$ 60	335	1,115	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
20	720	0	645	1,365	800	0	750	1,550	900	0	860	1,760
27	600	44	NA	644	750	$ 50	NA	800	900	$ 50	0	950
41	500	120	700	1,320	600	150	770	1,520	750	150	900	1,800
42	720	100	777	1,597	960	110	800	1,870	1,200	120	825	2,145
Four-Year Institutions												
5	0	$1,020	$ 976	$1,996	0	$1,500	$1,080	$2,580	0	$2,000	$1,400	$3,400
6	$ 620	55	0	675	$ 900	80	0	980	$1,100	90	0	1,190
9	1,175	125	950	2,250	1,800	200	1,275	3,275	2,500	250	1,650	2,425
10	945	0	825	1,770	1,500	0	1,150	2,650	1,700	0	1,300	3,000
12	930	130	785	1,845	1,100	150	930	2,180	1,300	200	1,115	2,615
13	848	58	734	1,640	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
17	670	10	780	1,460	NA	NA	930	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
18	900	2	780	1,682	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
19	800	119	700	1,619	1,050	129	975	2,154	1,175	141	1,150	2,466
21	775	25	0	800	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
25	775	NA	700	1,475	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
26	900	0	848	1,748	1,250	0	1,084	2,334	1,600	0	1,300	2,900
28	1,200	150	760	2,110	1,500	175	900	2,575	1,800	200	1,100	3,100
29	450	150	640	1,240	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
34	1,089	0	804	1,893	1,200	0	885	2,085	1,350	0	1,075	2,425
35	1,390	85	800	2,275	1,550	100	900	2,550	1,700	110	925	2,735

Average Cost to Student (continued)

Inst. Code	1970 Tuition	1970 General Fees	1970 Room & Board	1970 Total	1975 Tuition	1975 General Fees	1975 Room & Board	1975 Total	1980 Tuition	1980 General Fees	1980 Room & Board	1980 Total
38	$ 800	$ 50	$1,200	$2,050	$ 900	$ 60	$1,300	$2,260	$2,050	$ 125	$ 975	$3,150
40	1,050	70	875	1,995	1,550	100	925	2,575	2,050	125	975	3,150
47	1,225	0	960	2,185	1,600	0	1,225	2,825	2,000	0	1,565	3,565
48	755	77	810	1,642	879	90	935	1,895	1,000	115	1,080	2,195
52	1,080	0	825	1,905	1,378	0	1,051	2,429	1,759	0	1,341	3,100
54	960	0	740	1,700	1,200	50	900	2,150	1,500	100	1,050	2,650
55	1,500	0	850	2,350	2,000	0	950	2,950	2,500	0	1,000	3,500
56	990	105	750	1,845	1,125	105	850	2,080	1,350	105	1,000	2,455
Graduate Institutions												
1	$1,400	$ 55	$ 682	$2,127	$1,650	$ 60	$ 740	$2,450	$1,900	$ 65	$ 813	$2,778
3	800	200	1,000	2,000	1,000	250	1,300	2,550	1,200	300	1,500	3,000
36	1,275	0	865	2,140	2,300	0	1,400	3,700	3,500	0	1,900	5,400
49	1,850	280	870	3,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
52	1,860	0	1,135	2,995	2,400	0	1,280	3,680	2,900	0	1,425	3,325
Graduate Tuition												
1	$1,800				$2,000				$2,200			
3	No difference between undergraduate and graduate											
36	No difference between undergraduate and graduate											
49	925				NA				NA			
52	1,760				2,400				2,900			

APPENDIX H

Enrollment Capacity

Inst. Code	*Capacity to Enroll with Current Faculty & Facilities*	*Capacity to Enroll with Current Facilities and Additional Faculty*
Two-Year Institutions		
8	117	75
16	55	0
20	128	353
27	96	170
41	255	250
42	96	100
SUBTOTAL	747	948
Four-Year Institutions		
5	182	0
6	97	100
9	36	450
10	436	500
12	115	200
13	414	350
17	158	600
18	86	250
19	24	100
21	316	30
25	114	250
26	48	200
28	242	475
29	24	0
34	19	140
35	59	56
38	57	275
40	87	300
43	182	100
47	69	0
48	87	0
52	45	0
54	62	150
55	143	75
56	134	0
SUBTOTAL	3,418	4,601
Graduate Institutions		
1	314	600
3	44	150
32	307	*
36	110	0
49	55	35
SUBTOTAL	830	785
GRAND TOTAL	4.248	6.334

* Could accept upperclass and graduate nonresident students in selected curricular.